DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 206 HE 006 103

AUTHOR	Russel, John H.
TITLE	Seven Liberal Arts Colleges Revisited.
INSTITUTION	Toledo Univ., Ohio. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	May 74
NOTE	110p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Toledo, 2801 West Bancroft, Toledo, Ohio 43606 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Budgeting; Case Studies; College Curriculum; College Faculty; Decision Making; *Educational Administration; Enrollment Trends; *Governance; *Higher Education; Liberal Arts; *Private Colleges; Trustees
IDENTIFIERS	*College of New Rochelle; Juniata College; Knox College; Randolph Macon Womens College; Regis College; Southwestern at Memphis; Whitman College

ABSTRACT

In the early 1960's the United States Office of Education, using a case study approach, made an inquiry into patterns of academic administration in the liberal arts college. Following a review of this first study and the 1973 followup study, individual reports for seven participating colleges are presented based on visits made between late March and early May in 1973. Each report begins with a brief summary on control, programming, staffing, and enrollments. The section on governance includes a summary of the roles and interrelationships of trustees, faculty, and students. The next section deals with the development of policy and its implementation in such areas as faculty personnel, curriculum, instruction, and budgeting. The last section concerns changes in academic governance at these colleges during the past 10 years. Colleges discussed include the College of New Rochelle, Juniata College, Knox College, Randolph-Macon Women's College, Regis College, Southwestern at Memphis, and Whitman College. (MJM)

ED 100206

Seven Liberal Arts Colleges Revisited

John H. Russel

The Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Toledo
May, 1974

HE 006 103

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
University of Toledo
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Published by The Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Toledo

Copyright © 1974 by The University of Toledo

Table of Contents

The First Study: 1964 5

The Follow-up Study: 1973 11

College of New Rochelle 23

Juniata College 39

Knox College 51

Randolph-Macon Woman's College 62

Regis College 74

Southwestern At Memphis 85

Whitman College 96

Foreword

Great quantities of material are written every year that purport to enlighten our understanding of administrative practices and procedures in higher education. Much of these are basically theoretical. Increasingly, more contain "hard data" descriptions of "administration." Yet, in almost every case, the materials deal with a static, single point-in-time concept of administration and do not, at all, illustrate the development and interplay of administrative practices and procedures that develop over time.

This present manuscript attempts to look at the dynamics of change and development in administration at seven liberal arts colleges that were first studied by the author in 1964. Professor John H. Russel, of our Center and the Department of Higher Education, recently has returned from a sabbatical during which he was able to revisit those same seven colleges ten years later. His "longitudinal" perspective has something unique to teach us concerning administration at these colleges.

Dr. Russel has been at The University of Toledo since completing service at the United States Office of Education in 1965. He has held various administrative positions throughout the years, including Academic Dean and Acting President of Shimer College, an affiliate of The University of Chicago. Dr. Russel's interests focus on administration.

The Center is pleased to bring these observations to your attention.

W. Frank Hull IV
Director

CHAPTER I

THE FIRST STUDY
Purpose and Scope

In the early 1960s the United States Office of Education, using a case study approach, made an inquiry into patterns of academic administration in the liberal arts college. The original study[1] included nine colleges, all privately controlled or church affiliated, offering no degrees beyond the baccalaureate. They were all regionally accredited, and in the numbers enrolled they resembled the average-sized liberal arts college of that period. Six of the nine were coeducational; two were for women only, and one was for men only. The nine colleges were located in the far Northwest, in the Rocky Mountains, in the Central and Southern states, and in the Middle Atlantic states.

The nine "strong" colleges for the Russel and Ayers study were identified by an advisory jury from the 428 *regionally accredited* baccalaureate level liberal arts colleges.

The case studies of a decade ago were developed by the academic deans in the respective colleges. The mutually agreed upon outline gave emphasis to the development of policy and its implementation in a range of academic areas. The major concerns were on such items as faculty personnel, curriculum, instruction, and academic budgeting. The essays tended to stress the process and the personnel involved in policy development rather than the actual content of policy itself.

Higher Education in the Early Sixties

Academic governance in the early sixties rested largely with the administration and faculty. The student was

---

[1] John H. Russel and Archie R. Ayers, *Academic Administration, Case Studies in the Liberal Arts Colleges*, Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964.

treated as the "product" of the educational system rather than as a participant according to Corson in his study on governance published in 1960.[2]

At the time of the 1964 Russel and Ayers study, higher education was entering a period of what many considered unlimited expansion. Ten years earlier about 2.3 million students were enrolled in higher education, with approximately half of these in public and half in private colleges and universities. In 1950 almost two-thirds of the ,851 institutions of that period were privately controlled or church related.

By 1960 the enrollment was almost 3.6 million with about 60 per cent enrolled in the publicly controlled institutions and 40 per cent in the private or church-related colleges. The growth during the 1950s had been impelled by Sputnik and the resulting National Defense Education Act, by the demands of a developing technology, and by an increasing recognition of the values of a college education. Despite the proportionate decline in the private college enrollment between 1950 and 1960, the actual enrollment in the private colleges had increased 22 per cent. The private colleges continued to represent about two-thirds of the total number of post-secondary institutions, reported as numbering 2,008 in 1960.

Higher Education after the Mid-Sixties

Since the publication of the Russel and Ayers report on *Academic Administration*, there have been many changes both in higher education in the United States and in society itself. The most notable changes are in the role of the student in academic governance and an increasing involvement on the part of the faculty. One writer has suggested that the period of the 1960s was the "decade of the student" much as the period of the 1950s had been the "decade of the faculty member," certainly an oversimplification of the actual facts but indicative of a trend. For whatever reasons, a series of student "demands" in the 1960s resulted in a new, or re-

---

[2] John J. Corson, *Governance of Colleges and Universities*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960.

newed, involvement on the part of students at various levels in college or university governance.

The "inescapable interdependence among governing boards, administration, faculty, students, and others" was noted in all aspects of college and university government by a publication of the American Association of University Professors.[3] The value of a "joint effort" was stressed in long-range planning, decisions on physical resources, budgeting, selection of officers, and determination of faculty status. But for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter, methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process, the faculty has the primary responsibility with an occasional veto action by a president or board. Budget constraints continued to affect the decision-making process.

In this same 1966 Statement, the AAUP had suggested a somewhat limited role for the student in college governance urging that "ways be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness."[4] By 1970, however, a committee of the AAUP advanced a new statement directed toward student participation, stressing the concept of shared authority, the exercise of which "requires tolerance, respect, and a sense of community which arises from participation in a common enterprise."[5] This report identified the areas in which student involvement is commonly found as admissions, academic programs, academic courses and staff, academic evaluation, academic environment, extracurricular activities, student regulations, student discipline. The AAUP Committee T further recognized a student right to voice opinion concerning the institution's budget, its physical resources, and its relationship with groups or agencies external to the campus.[6]

---

[3] "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, 1966," *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports*, 1973 edition, pp. 38-39.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[5] "Student Participation in College and University Government: A Report of Committee T, 1970," *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports*, 1973, pp. 49-51.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

By 1970, McGrath had completed his study, *Should Students Share the Power?* After advancing several safeguards, he gave an affirmative answer, emphasizing the need for accountability on the part of students, as well as on the part of other members of the academic community. Even though he acknowledged many reasons for excluding students from the governance process, he felt that the positive reasons for their involvement outweighed those advanced for their exclusion. For colleges offering only the bachelor's degree, he noted a fairly high level of student involvement in faculty committees dealing with curriculum, library, and student life with little or no involvement, however, in committees concerned with faculty selection, promotion, and tenure.[7]

Other professional groups and other authorities were also reviewing, studying, and expressing opinions and findings on academic governance. The American Association of Higher Education advanced a position under the label of "shared authority." Governance was shared by the administration and faculty but with appropriate involvement on the part of the student members of the academic community. Sharing in governance was advanced on these grounds:

1. Those whose concerns and lives are most affected by campus activities should surely have a part in their control.
2. Those who are most competent to do the work of the campus should have a voice that ensures the effective use of their competence.
3. Those whose cooperation is essential to the effectiveness of the campus in its work should have a place in governing that facilitates their continuing cooperation.
4. Those whose sponsorship and resources created and sustain the institution and thus make possible the opportunity of higher education, are entitled

[7] Earl T. McGrath, *Should Students Share the Power?*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970.

to protect and further their purposes and interests.[8]

Archie Dykes conducted a systematic inquiry into the role of the faculty in the decision process for the American Council on Education. He reported some ambivalence in role perception as well as some discrepancies between the perceived role of faculty and the actual realities of the decision process. Faculty members felt that they should have a strong voice in making "educational" decisions, but at the same time there was an apparent reluctance to "accept the new realities of participation."[9]

By the early 1970s, some deceleration in the growth of American higher education was apparent. The U.S. Office of Education in the fall of 1972 reported about 2,800 institutions of higher education with enrollments of approximately 9,200,000. By this time the enrollments in the privately controlled colleges and universities had declined to 23.5 per cent of the total. The Office of Education reported for this period a total of 765 baccalaureate level colleges, of this number 680 were under private auspices—either independently controlled (265) or reporting some level of church affiliation (276 Protestant, 133 Catholic, 6 other).[10]

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, using slightly different data and relying on the Fall 1970 Report of the U.S. Office of Education, identified 703 of the 2,827 institutions of higher education as liberal arts colleges, just about 25 per cent of the total number of post-secondary institutions. These 703 colleges, all relatively small, enrolled about 8 per cent of the total college and university population. The Carnegie Commission briefly described the liberal arts college as follows:

---

[8] Morris Keeton, *Shared Authority on Campus*, Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1971, p. 9.

[9] Archie R. Dykes, *Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making*, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968, p. 38.

[10] *Education Directory, 1972-73, Higher Education*, Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1972.

> Most of the liberal arts colleges are private, and the relatively few that are public include some state colleges of recent origin that are likely to grow rapidly and become comprehensive colleges in the near future. Private liberal arts colleges range from the highly prestigious institutions with nation-wide reputations to small, struggling, under-financed colleges . . . Liberal arts colleges are frequently extensively involved in training teachers.[11]

The late 1960s and early 70s brought many changes which have had a direct bearing on the roles of faculty and students in academic governance. The gradual deceleration in enrollment growth in post-secondary education, the developing oversupply of qualified faculty personnel, the continuing shift of enrollment toward publicly controlled education, the mounting inflation creating budgetary crises in all kinds of colleges and universities have all had their effect on the internal governance structure of the liberal arts colleges. These are factors which have pushed faculty members into an increasingly active role in governance.

At the same time students, increasingly critical of their college experience, have entered much more actively into the process of academic policy development and implementation to bring about changes in curriculum and graduation requirements.

---

[11] *New Students and New Places*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971, pp. 20-21.

CHAPTER II

THE FOLLOW-UP STUDY: 1973
Plan and Participants

In view of the many changes reported in the last ten years in the liberal arts colleges and in all post-secondary education, a new study was made of those colleges which had participated in the 1964 inquiry. This study was focused on the components of the college governance structure, on the personnel involved in the structure, and on their processes in making decisions in academic areas. The questions asked were: Who determines policy in academic areas? Who carries out these policies? What are the significant changes in the past ten years?

Seven of the nine original colleges agreed to participate in the 1973 inquiry. The two non-participants had experienced recent administrative changes which precluded their participation. The colleges which took part in the re-visit are listed in Table 1. Enrollment figures are reported for the fall of 1972.

The seven colleges of the follow-up study, while showing somewhat larger enrollments than in the earlier study, can still be classified as having middle range enrollments for liberal arts colleges. The seven colleges continue to hold membership in their respective regional accrediting associations. Two colleges report differences in control: The College of New Rochelle and Juniata College report "independent" control rather than Roman Catholic and Church of the Brethren respectively. The two women's colleges of the earlier study, The College of New Rochelle and Randolph-Macon Woman's College, generally limit their enrollment to women at the undergraduate level. Regis College, limited to men in the early 1960s, is now coeducational.

The earlier study, although it included some campus

Table 1

PARTICIPATING LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES — 1973

Institution	Location	Control	Accrediting Agency	Size	Student Body Type
College of New Rochelle	New Rochelle, N.Y.	Indep (R.C.)	Mid. St.	786 (964)	Women
Juniata College	Huntingdon, Pa.	Indep. (Church of Brethren)	Mid. St.	1,207 (800)	Coed
Knox College	Galesburg, Ill.	Indep.	N.C.	1,385 (961)	Coed
Randolph-Macon Woman's College	Lynchburg, Va.	Un. Meth.	S.	754 (688)	Women
Regis College	Denver, Colo.	R. C.	N.C.	1,330 (1,021)	Coed (Men)
Southwestern At Memphis	Memphis, Tenn.	Presby. U.S.	S.	1,090 (734)	Coed
Whitman College	Walla Walla, Wash.	Indep.	N.W.	1,067 (880)	Coed

Note: Information given in parenthesis indicates the status reported in the 1964 study.

12
114

visits by the investigators, relied primarily on the perceptions and observations of the academic deans. In contrast, the 1973 study was developed entirely by means of two-day campus visits by the investigator with structured interviews with those holding a variety of positions. Interviews were held with the president, the dean or provost (in one exception with his immediate predecessor), with faculty groups or committees involved in governance processes, and with students, some of whom were more involved than others. While the role of the trustees was explored in every college, trustees in only three of the seven colleges were interviewed: a chairman of one board and actively involved local trustees of two other boards.

The essays developed by the investigator are based on the comments of many persons, as well as on information contained in various college documents. Insofar as possible, the essays reflect a consensus of perceptions without any attempt to highlight differences of opinion of different groups on a given campus. All of the essays have been read by major officers in each college in an attempt to insure a reasonable level of accuracy in the facts and impressions recorded by the investigator. The comparisons among the colleges and the interpretations of change have been made by the investigator.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Trustees

The boards of the seven colleges consist predominantly of lay members. Although they all have the corporate legal responsibility for the operation of the college, they have, in varying degrees, delegated that responsibility to the administration and faculty of the respective colleges. Only one college has a bicameral board, and one college is in the process of changing from a predominantly faculty board to one with a wider religious and lay representation. Several boards have

recently opened their meetings to representatives from both faculty and students.

Four of the colleges specified that faculty members participate in board activities and five reported some student involvement. In two, faculty involvement means participation in both committee and board sessions. One board opens its regular sessions to faculty representatives but closes its committee meetings to them. Another board has closed its regular sessions to faculty representatives but has opened its committee meetings to them. In most cases, faculty involvement includes full participation short of the "vote." Faculty members are usually excluded from auditing and nominating committees, presumably areas in which they might have less interest and competence.

Student involvement in both committee and regular sessions of the trustees is found in two colleges. In the other three colleges reporting student participation, two boards open their general sessions but not their committee sessions to students while one board opens its committee meetings but not its general board meetings.

Faculty

The faculties in six of the colleges meet as regular corporate entities. Students meet as "participants" or "observers" in three of these colleges, but in no instance do students serve as voting members of a faculty unit. They do, however, vote as members of a limited number of faculty committees. The seventh college, while recognizing the faculty as a separate entity, provides for faculty action as an integral part of more inclusive college councils with membership drawn from the administration and student body as well as from the faculty.

The influence of the faculty in academic governance has been of particular significance in establishing faculty personnel policies and procedures and in developing curriculum.

Six of the seven colleges provide for faculty participation

in personnel committees of some type. The seventh college secures personnel recommendations from department chairmen, who send them through an administrative hierarchy.[1] Of the six with personnel committees, two colleges include both faculty and student membership. In one college, students vote; in the other they have an advisory role. Three other colleges restrict the membership of their personnel committees to faculty members only. One of these limits its decisions to policy only without concern for implementation. The sixth college names separate committees to examine each faculty member up for promotion or tenure.

The actions of these personnel committees are largely advisory. In the five instances where committees are involved in policy implementation, only one college has developed the process in such a way that the recommendations of the hierarchy are fully meshed with committee action. In the four others with committee involvement, the investigator was led to believe that the committee process is separate from the hierarchical process until the recommendations reach the designated top administrative office. One president reported that the dean comes in one door and the committee another door, each with independently developed recommendations. Another president emphasized that the committee's decision is not advisory but is rather a decision with which the president can or cannot concur. In the last analysis, the locus of final recommendation concerning faculty promotion and tenure in all seven colleges lies with the president of the college with the ultimate decision resting with the board of trustees.

The faculty personnel committees seem to have very little involvement in decisions relating to salaries. Usually deans and faculty members responded that decisions in this area are essentially administrative; that is, made by the president and dean. One college did report that the dean asks the personnel committee to rate all faculty members in terms of deserving a salary increase as "an above average amount,"

[1] This college, however, opens its faculty meetings to students and its board meetings, both regular sessions and committee meetings, are open to both faculty and students.

"average amount," or "below average amount." Another college reported requesting this kind of information from department chairmen. In the other colleges various kinds of arrangements provide the necessary information on which the central administration bases its decisions on salaries.

Curriculum

All seven colleges have established curriculum committees as part of their general structure. Two of the colleges reported relatively new committees charged with "educational development" or "educational planning." In these colleges, the "regular" curriculum committees act on the usual adjustments needed in college programs, and the curriculum development or planning committees explore innovative approaches in undergraduate curriculum. In the other five colleges, the "regular" faculty committees responsible for curriculum concerns are charged with both ongoing and long-range planning. All of the committees reported student membership. Usually, the academic dean or provost is a member and sometimes is the presiding officer of the committee.

All of the colleges reported some type of divisional or departmental organization of faculty and curriculum. In general, departmental membership is made up of faculty personnel only. Two colleges, however, have departed from this traditional arrangement. In one college, student "majors" participate to a limited extent in department meetings. Another college has formally established departmental boards which have both curriculum and personnel responsibilities and an equal ratio of faculty to student membership.

Students

Six of the seven colleges reported relatively active and viable student corporate groups. One college in which students participate in faculty sessions, faculty committees, and trustee meetings indicated, rather surprisingly, that their student government had actually ceased operations. In two of the six colleges students support, separate from student government, a vigorous and active Honor System. In one of

these colleges the students, as part of the Honor System, arrange and direct student self-scheduled final examinations.

Still another student group is charged with and accepts the responsibility for a student-planned January interterm program. In most of the colleges, including the one in which the student government is inactive, students play active roles in general sessions and committees of boards of trustees and in general and committee meetings of college faculties. Students have their greatest involvement, however, in decisions relating to their own activities.

Students in these seven colleges find a greater acceptance of their participation in academic governance in the area of curriculum development and less acceptance in the area of faculty personnel. In only two colleges are students actively involved in the deliberations of the faculty personnel committees, and in only one college do students actually vote as committee members. In this instance, faculty members hold six positions on the committee and students three, a proportionately stronger position for students than in the preceding year, a change voted by the faculty.

GOVERNANCE — 1973

In the seven participating colleges, boards of trustees as in 1964 continue to hold and exercise an ultimate legal authority and responsibility for all activities. Specifically, they exercise this role in matters relating to academic governance. In traditional fashion, each board has assigned administrative responsibility to a president and through him to other specified administrative officers. Each board has either directly or implicitly assigned curriculum and instructional responsibilities to the several faculties, both corporately and individually. Generally, the board has assigned responsibilities for student affairs to administration and faculty rather than directly to students.

In an earlier day, and no longer than ten years ago, the

lines which separated the various components in the structure and process of these seven colleges were clearly drawn.[2] The 1973 study indicates, however, that these lines are no longer so sharply marked. Several of the boards of trustees have opened both their general sessions and committee meetings to selected or elected representatives of the faculty and student body. Even though faculty personnel and students are not actually serving as board members, they are reportedly actively participating in board sessions. In those boards that have not opened their general and committee sessions, there is a clearly established means of communication, either formal or informal, with both faculty members and students.

Boards continue to consider the president as their chief executive officer and continue to exercise a control in the academic governance structure through the annual budget. The new openness in board activities providing improved communication has led all groups to a better understanding of the process of academic governance.

Perhaps an even more marked change in recent years has been a growing openness in general faculty sessions and committee meetings. With few exceptions, and those relate primarily to the faculty personnel area, students serve effectively on many faculty committees. Their earlier role in the academic areas was minor, but their voices were heard. Now they take a much more active role and their voices are clear and their influence is felt.

Along with many other liberal arts colleges of the 1970s, several of these seven colleges face budget strictures imposed by current economic conditions and by enrollment trends. The resulting decrease in the mobility of faculty members has led these colleges, like many others across the country, to reassess their policies relative to faculty tenure.

At the end of the 1972-73 academic year, the seven participating colleges reported a wide range in the percentage

---

[2] Russel and Ayers, Ch.II.

of their full-time faculty members on tenure, from a high of 80 per cent to a low of 43 per cent, with a median of 55 per cent. Coincidentally, and of passing interest only, the college reporting 80 per cent of its faculty members on tenure is the college that does not have an organized faculty personnel committee. In contrast, the college which reported 43 per cent of the faculty on tenure is the one college which has students as voting members on the faculty personnel committee. In all seven colleges, the concept of faculty tenure has full acceptance, but they face the dilemma of the competitive claims for the value of tenure vis-à-vis the claims for flexibility in staffing. Policy decisions, as well as their implementation, involving criteria for faculty rank, salary levels in relationship to rank, and appointment of new faculty are matters of great concern to the seven colleges. The financial burden of any college becomes excessive if very large proportions of the faculty are in both the top faculty rank and in the top salary brackets.

All seven colleges expect to continue to offer the assurance of faculty tenure, and all subscribe to the policy of academic freedom for students and faculty. More significant, perhaps, is their recognition that excellence in teaching is of paramount importance.

These seven colleges must, however, eventually reassess all of their policies and procedures in the entire personnel area as growing proportions of the faculty attain tenure status. Policy changes may well include expanding support for sabbaticals, in-service education, attendance and participation in sessions of professional and discipline-oriented associations.

In the general areas of curriculum and instruction, all seven colleges reported their concern for responsible action and for relevance. They also reported the involvement of students in a variety of faculty standing committees charged with the review of curriculum and recommendation for its change. Using ad hoc committees, another college has only recently gone through a reorganization of its curriculum.

Decision making in the area of academic budgeting continues to be basically an administrative function. Evidence points to recommendations emanating from department chairmen through a divisional structure, if appropriate, to the chief academic officer, and thence to the college president. The administrator responsible for the detailed development of the budget is usually the chief business officer. Two colleges reported the recent creation and use of special budget development and review committees, which have representation from the administration, faculty, and students to act in an advisory capacity to the president. One other college reported tentative plans, not yet implemented, to involve a faculty executive committee in the budget process. Final decisions on budget are made by the boards of trustees. Those colleges which have faculty and student participation at the board level, in the general sessions and budget committees, may have a minimal influence on budget decisions.

During the past ten years all of the campuses reflect a shift of varying degree from an administrative-oriented decision-making structure toward a "shared" structure in which members of the faculty and student body have a growing responsibility. This shift is reflected in a new openness and a new acceptance by administration, faculty, and students of their "joint" role in the academic decision process. In most of the colleges, the faculty personnel committees now have a significant impact on the decision process relating to promotion and tenure and, to less extent, to the amount of salary. In at least one college students participate as voting members of the faculty personnel committee; in another, they participate but do not have a vote.

A shift in faculty involvement in one college is reflected in a collective bargaining contract. A change in another college is evident in a completely new governance structure designed to involve administration, faculty and students: the structure provides for new governance units and at the same time abandons many of the corporate units traditionally found in many colleges. Another college has established a position of faculty chairman, who provides faculty representa-

tion within the top administrative council. The individual holding this position serves as the faculty presiding officer, as chairman of the academic council, and as a member of the major academic committee of the college.

Three colleges have added the title of provost to their administrative structure. Generally, the title is "provost and dean." The new position usually includes some delegated presidential powers, often those relating to the coordination of internal administration, and an extension of responsibility for the area of academic administration to include the area of student personnel administration. An apparent purpose of this type of change is to free the president for overall long-range planning and development and possibly to provide the internal administrator with what might be considered a more prestigious title. In only one instance does the new title carry with it a new line of communication to the board of trustees in academic matters. However, the president of this college continues to be the board's chief executive officer in all phases of administration.

Governance in these seven colleges tends to reflect the pattern of governance in American higher education in the 1970s. Although the basic structure of governance and the areas of decision making in these colleges have changed little through the years, the kinds of personnel who serve as participants in the structure have changed markedly. These seven colleges, not long ago strongly directed by a central administration, now have a growing involvement by both faculty and students in their academic governance.

As in higher education at large, faculty members, with an increasing number of students participating, play a major role in the decision process relating to curriculum and instruction. Faculty members also have a significant role in decision making in the faculty personnel area, with students having only a modest influence. In academic governance, the seven colleges reflect the trend away from centralization in the administration to academic governance shared by administration, faculty, and students.

GOVERNANCE AT THE SEVEN COLLEGES

Individual reports for the seven participating colleges appear in Chapters III through IX, based on two-day campus visits made between late March and early May in 1973.

Each report begins with a brief summary on control, programming, staffing and enrollments. The section on governance includes a summary of the roles and interrelationship of trustees, faculty and students. The next section deals with the development of policy and its implementation in such areas as faculty personnel, curriculum, instruction and budgeting. The last section concerns changes in academic governance at these colleges during the past ten years with the comparisons based on the 1964 study by Russel and Ayers on academic administration.

CHAPTER III

THE COLLEGE OF NEW ROCHELLE

The College of New Rochelle was established in 1904 in New Rochelle, New York, by a group of religious of the Ursuline Order. Since its founding it has been governed by its own Board of Trustees. Its stated purpose is two-fold: "the quest of meaning in life and a commitment to academic excellence and disciplined scholarship."

In describing its courses of study, the College makes this statement about its general direction:

> The College of New Rochelle has been from its beginnings a residential liberal arts college for women. Within the context of the liberal arts tradition, it offers not only undergraduate programs leading to the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Fine Arts degree, but also graduate programs designed to prepare teachers to carry on the work of education in elementary and secondary schools. The values placed upon language, art, the power of knowledge, the individual person, characteristic of the liberal tradition, are reflected in the specialties of the graduate degree programs: The Master of Arts in Art Education, the Master of Science in Education with a choice of concentration in reading, special education, or therapeutic education.

The College of New Rochelle is definitely a woman's college at the undergraduate level. The cooperative arrangements with nearby Iona College, which enrolls both men and women, create occasional class situations where there are coeducational registrations. In addition, both men and women are registered in the New Rochelle graduate level program and in the "new resources" program.

The College uses a semester calendar with the first semester scheduled for completion before the Christmas vacation and the second beginning about the fourth week in January.

The Intersession, which is scheduled in early January, is planned for graduate students only. Graduation requirements, B.A. or B.F.A., are set for 120 semester hours.

Every student is expected to take some work in each of the major areas of the liberal arts: Humanities, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and Social Sciences. These requirements which include the changes of Spring, 1973, are as follows:

Humanities — thirty-six semester credit-hours, with these six areas included—Art or Music, Ancient Languages and Literature, English Language and Literature, Modern Foreign Language and Literature, Philosophy, Religious Studies. *Change:* eighteen semester credit hours with five of the above six areas mandated.

Natural Sciences and Mathematics—seven or eight semester credit-hours, including at least one laboratory science course. Two of the following areas were to be included: Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics. *Change:* Elimination of the mandated laboratory science course.

Social Sciences—twelve semester credit-hours in three of the following areas: Economics, History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology. *Change:* none.

Physical Education — four semester courses, no credit. *Change:* none.

The College of New Rochelle offers twenty-three departmental areas of concentration. In addition, the College began to provide for interdepartmental majors in 1972-73. This type of major emphasizes " a particular culture, historical period, or topic of concern, or it may be a combination of studies in two or three departments in which the student is particularly interested and competent.' Either type of major requires approximately one-third of the student's four-year undergraduate program.

Through the American Institute for Foreign Study, the

College of New Rochelle arranges for study abroad. This program is designed especially for students majoring in a foreign language.

The College of New Rochelle reports a full-time faculty of 88 persons: 27 men and 61 women. Forty-two of these individuals hold the Ph.D. degree. The faculty includes 26 *religious women and one priest.*

In the Fall of 1972, 786 students were registered in the regular undergraduate program. These were mostly full-time students. (The actual full-time equivalency was 772.) The graduating class of the preceding year—bachelor's level only—included majors from fifteen areas. English and Psychology had the largest numbers, both in excess of forty. Other departments reporting ten or more graduates were Art, Biology, French, History, Mathematics, Political Science, and Sociology. These seven departments in no instances reported more than twenty graduates.

A few years ago, close to 50 per cent of the CNR graduates entered graduate or professional schools. That figure is now reported at 25 to 30 per cent. There has also been some apparent shift from registration in graduate school to registration in professional school.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Trustees

The bylaws of the Board of Trustees of the College of New Rochelle clearly indicate the ultimate responsibility which the Board has for the operation of the College. The Board must number at least five persons and may not number more than twenty-five. Included in the total of twenty-five is the President of the College, ex officio, and one alumnae trustee selected by the Directors of the Alumnae Association, and twenty-three others chosen for three-year terms by a co-opting process. Except for the President of the College, Trustees may not serve for more than two consecutive terms.

Several references to the governance of the College itself appear in the delineation of the duties of the President of the College. For example, the bylaws state that the President "shall appoint and fix the duties of and dismiss members of the administrative and academic staffs subject to such regulations as the Board may adopt." Other statements point out that the President shall preside at faculty meetings and will "supervise all official publications of the College." The bylaws also note the Board's special prerogative for granting academic degrees.

The committee structure of the Board of Trustees suggests the relationships to the academic area of governance. At its Board meeting in December, 1972, the Board opened all of its committee sessions, with the exception of the Executive Committee and the Nominating Committee, to one faculty member and one student in each, to be chosen by the faculty and student body. These persons were to be designated as fully participating *members* of the committees. However, it should be noted that the sessions of the Board itself were not to be opened to representatives of the faculty and student body.

The Board committees are as follows:

(1) *Executive Committee*, consisting of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Board, the President of the College, and four elected members from the Board, with designated powers between regular board meetings;

(2) *Financial Committee*, appointed by the chairman, with responsibilities pertaining to financial and business activities;

(3) *Investment Committee*, appointed by the chairman, with responsibility for the investment of funds;

(4) *Development Committee*, appointed by the chairman, with responsibility for advising on fund raising;

(5) *Nominating Committee*, appointed by the chairman with responsibility for recommendation in the election of Trustees;

(6) *Faculty-Student Relations Committee*,[1] appointed by the chairman, with two subcommittees—one on faculty relations and one on student relations. The subcommittee on faculty has the responsibility for advising the Board on matters pertaining to faculty salary policy, faculty employment, faculty appointments, promotion and tenure policies, educational policy, faculty resignations and leaves of absence and on all other matters pertaining to relations with the faculty of the College. This committee shall confer with the President, Academic Dean,[2] and various faculty committees from time to time. The subcommittee on students has the responsibility for advising the Board on activities relating to student life, such as student housing; food service; health service; student government; student publication and organizations; student rules and regulations; campus speakers; religious, cultural, and social programs; and other items pertaining to student welfare. This committee shall confer with the President, Dean of Students, and student committees from time to time.

(7) *Long-Range Planning Committee*, appointed by the chairman with responsibility for "creation and advancement of a comprehensive plan for the development of the College over a five-year period."

Faculty and Students

Growing out of extensive study, a new governance structure was adopted in January, 1971. Ratified by Faculty and

---

[1] Effective in September, 1973, renamed the Academic Affairs Committee and functioning as a single unit (no subcommittees). The responsibilities are essentially the same.

[2] Effective in September, 1973, the title of the chief academic officer of the College became provost.

Students in March, 1972, governance has moved along on a fairly even keel. Some elements in the structure carry over from an earlier period; other elements are completely new.

The new CNR structure calls for a high degree of cooperation and understanding among administration, faculty, and students. While these constituent groups may meet as separate integral groups from time to time, they are not established in the governance structure as decision-making bodies.

This new structure is best understood by a close examination of its various councils, committees, and boards. Each of these is fairly well outlined as to functions, membership, bylaws.

These groups are:

Council of the College. This council provides a forum for discussion of college community affairs, provides a means for continual evaluation of the direction of the College, raises and channels questions affecting the college community, and serves as a final board of appeal from decisions of any other council, with the exception of the Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Salary.[3]

Membership: Six faculty members (elected), six students (elected), the President of the College (without vote), Dean of the College, Dean of Students, Assistant to the President, Director of Alumnae Relations, one part-time faculty member.

Rank, Tenure, and Salary Committee. This committee participates with the President in College governance by forwarding its decisions to him in regard to the formulation and implementation of policies concerning faculty appointment, faculty rank and promotion, tenure, salary, and fringe benefits inclusive of professional improvement and advancement.

Membership: Six faculty members (elected and with tenure), the Dean of the College, the President (without vote).

---

[3] Faculty Handbook, The College of New Rochelle, November, 1972. Sec. Edn., p. 13.

Council of the Faculty. This council assumes responsibility for faculty meetings and faculty elections, reviews the direction of decisions made by the RTS Committee and serves as a board of appeals from its decisions, and in general furnishes a forum for faculty members and a means of communication between faculty and administration, faculty and students, and faculty members.

Membership: Nine full-time faculty members (elected) and the Dean of the College (without vote).

Council of the Students. This council serves as a continuing source of appraisal of the quality of student life, establishes or changes fundamental policies relevant to regulations made by councils and committees subsidiary to it, and conducts student elections.

Membership: The student body president, the four class presidents, three other students (one from each of the three subsidiary councils), one student elected from the Black Student community, two faculty advisers (elected by students but without vote), and the Dean of Students (without vote).

The subsidiary councils of the Council of the Students are the Day Students Council, the Residents Council, and the Activities Council.

Educational Policies Council. This council evaluates the objectives of the College and the nature, range, and pace of its efforts, raises and addresses basic questions concerning the long-range educational program of the College, and reviews existing and prospective physical resources relative to their role in the educational program of the College.

Membership: Six faculty members (elected), four students, the Dean of the College (without vote).

Academic Council. This council sets and supervises academic regulations and practices, implements academic policy insofar as it pertains to the college program as a whole, acts as a vehicle of communication for the various segments of the College in matters that directly pertain to the quality of the learning experience, evaluates the impact of the curriculum on the students, and sets and appraises the mechanics of the student advisement.

Membership: Five departmental chairmen (elected), five students from student members of departmental boards, the Dean of the College (without vote).

Finance and Development of Budget Committee. This committee advises the administration in all areas of finance and in the development of budget.

Membership: President of the College, Chief Financial Officer of the College, Director of Development, Dean of the College, Dean of Students, President of the Student Body, four elected faculty members—one each from these groups: Rank, Tenure, and Salary Committee; Educational Policies Council; Council of the Faculty; and Council of the Students.

Departmental Boards. Each department must have a formally organized board approved by the Educational Policies Council. The board of each department deals decisively with courses, credit requirements, curriculum changes, and departmental budget proposals. It makes recommendations and/or requests concerning broader educational issues, to be forwarded to the Educational Policies Council. In an advisory capacity it deals with hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion of faculty members and with student grievances.

The composition of the boards varies from department to department; where possible, there is an equal ratio of faculty and students.

In addition to these several groups devised as part of the governance structure, the College has additional administrative committees. In these instances the faculty members are appointed. These committees are:

Committee on Admissions. This committee reviews marginal applications and decides on admissions policies.

Membership: Director of Admissions (Chairman), Dean of the College, two faculty members appointed by the President.

Committee on Financial Aid. This committee designates the type and amount of financial aid awarded.

Membership: Director of Financial Aid, Dean of the College, Director of Admissions, and two faculty members appointed by the President.

Committee on Student Counseling. This committee reviews the records and current status of the students — both academic and non-academic.

Membership: Dean of the College, Dean of Students, Director of the Counseling Office.

Foreign Study Committee. This committee studies the program offered by various foreign institutions and evaluates them in relation to the NCR program.

Membership: Dean of the College and three faculty members—usually from the foreign language departments.

Committee on Honors. This committee is expected to decide on the norms for departmental and general honors, and to administer the Honors Program.

Membership: Dean of the College and two faculty members appointed by the President.

Community Leadership Program. This program deals with disadvantaged students.

Membership: Two faculty members who volunteer to work with the program.

At the close of its second full year of operation, the new governance structure had worked well even though there were a few problems. A recent decision on a change in the general education requirement for graduation is a case in point.

The Educational Policies Council spent a fair portion of the 1972-1973 academic year reviewing the basic core requirements of the undergraduate program. There had been a proposal that nine credit hours be required in each of these three major areas—Humanities, Social Sciences, and Science. The EPC had finally decided that the Humanities requirement should be reduced by half (36 to 18 hours with at least one course required in each of six major areas), that the Social Sciences requirement should remain unchanged, and that the Science hours should remain unchanged but the laboratory sciences requirement be removed. This decision was appealed and was heard by a special appeal board drawn from the Council of the College. The appellants won their appeal and the decision was returned to the Educational Policies Council for its reconsideration. The council in a two-

hour session reviewed the case and unanimously reaffirmed its earlier decision. At this point, at least on short notice, there was no specified body in the new structure which could make what might be called a final decision. Had there been time, the Council of the College might have taken jurisdiction over the case and made a final decision.

Because advance registration for the Fall of 1973 was to start three days later, the Dean of the College, with the approval of the President and in the face of what seemed to be a strong student demand for a decision *before* registration, made a decision, a step not actually provided in the governance structure. His decision was to accept the EPC recommendation with one exception, and that was to require work in only five out of six areas in the Humanities. He accepted the proposed reduction from 36 to 18 hours.

There have thus far been no appeals from decisions of the Rank, Tenure, and Salary Committee. Such appeals would be heard by the Faculty Council, which is an all-faculty group but not all tenured. When and if such appeals are to be heard there will have to be a clarification of the breadth of the inquiry and of the feasibility of an appeal from a decision by a tenured group to one which may not have tenure. Is the appeal to relate to procedural matters only or will it touch on the actual substantive issues of the situation? And when, or if, these two groups do not agree, what body is empowered to make a final decision?

ACADEMIC DECISION MAKING

Faculty Personnel Area

Policy Development. The basic policy on faculty qualifications is an apparent emphasis on the earned doctorate whenever appropriate for a particular position and the quality of "good teaching." Membership in the Ursuline community is not a basic qualification for a position on the New Rochelle faculty.

The College of New Rochelle, as a matter of policy, uses the four traditional faculty ranks. This policy, approved by the Administration of the College, provides for "at least thirteen years of *outstanding* college teaching" for appointment to the rank of full professor. The doctor's degree, or its equivalent, is required in the two ranks of associate professor and professor.

Tenure at The College of New Rochelle comes after seven years of teaching at the College or after four years at the College of New Rochelle if the teacher has had at least three years elsewhere. Usually the doctorate is required for an appointment to a position of tenure. The faculty member who is eligible for tenure but who has not completed his doctorate may be continued in an untenured position on a year to year basis.

Salary scales which relate to rank have been drafted by the administration and approved by the Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Salary and by the Board of Trustees. There are no directions which suggest that salary decisions be based on "merit."

Department chairmen are as a matter of policy appointed on a three-year basis. The policy further directs that these appointments should be rotated among the department members as extensively as possible.

Faculty travel is encouraged within budget limitations.

Implementation. The recruitment, selection, and appointment of new faculty members originates in the department and particularly with the department chairman. A prospective faculty member is interviewed on campus by faculty members, students within the respective department, the Dean or the President—preferably by both. Once a decision to appoint has been made, the President and the Dean make a major decision on the rank to which the individual is to be appointed and on the salary which he is to be paid. The departmental board, which has an equal weighting of faculty

and student members, has an important decision-making role in the appointment process. The dossiers of the prospective faculty members are reviewed by the Faculty Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Salary.

Decisions on promotion, tenure, and renewal of contract rest with the Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Salary, and with the President of the College. The committee makes decisions, *not* recommendations. Several individuals emphasized that these were actual decisions, which could, however, be vetoed by the President of the College. They felt it important to note this type of approach in contrast with the notion of a committee's recommendation with an eventual decision by the President of the College. It is of interest to note that while the Rank, Tenure, and Salary Committee can make an independent decision, the President of the College participates in the development of that decision even though she has no vote in the Committee's final action.

The Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Salary is guided in its deliberations by recommendations from the departments and by evaluation from both faculty and students. Tenured faculty members within a department—or in related departments if none is tenured—are identified and requested by the President to submit evaluations of the individual coming up for tenure or promotion. Evaluations from students are routinely secured in the classes of all non-tenured faculty members. A recent revision in policy requires that evaluations will, in addition, be secured for all tenured faculty members every three years.

At this time (1972-73) 47 out of 88 full-time faculty members were reported on tenure. This represents 53 per cent of the full-time faculty. In 1973-74 the numbers actually shift to 46 out of 83, or 55 per cent. The administration of the College conveyed a concern about the growing percentage of full-time persons who were on tenure, concerns of both an economic and educational nature.

Salary decisions are automatic in that they actually relate to time in rank and to prior preparation. Any depar-

tures from the salary scale are the results of budget decisions. If the money is available, it is clearly the policy of the College to effect salary increases in accordance with the salary scale.

As the three-year term of a department chairman approaches its termination, the President or the Dean asks the members of the departmental board for their recommendations on the appointment. The Administration as a part of this process consults the Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Salary for its recommendation. The President makes the final decision, if possible adhering to a policy of rotation.

The President makes the final decision on the amount of funds in each instance of faculty professional travel.

Curriculum

Curriculum development and change at the College of New Rochelle are in accord with the philosophy of a Catholic liberal arts college. Within such a framework, approved by the Administration, many developments occur. For example, the Educational Policies Council recently examined the basic general requirements for the bachelor's degree. The council is empowered to make changes in the basic requirements. Any changes may be appealed to the Council of the College, but there is no "higher body" to redraft these decisions short of the Board of Trustees. At the level of adding and dropping courses, departmental boards may act, but always within the constraints of the college budget and of their best professional judgment.

Cooperative programs, supported at the department level and encouraged by the Administration, exist for the students of the College of New Rochelle and Iona College. Activities within the cooperative area with Iona College receive their major emphases at the departmental level. Here again budget and basic philosophical constraints are operative.

In the Spring of 1973 a new interdepartmental major

was launched with Iona College in Communication Arts. This development occurred after the Educational Policies Council had approved the notion of interdepartmental majors.

Instruction

The College of New Rochelle has no fixed policy on the proportions of the student body which should be commuting or boarding, transfer, minority, or any other. The general policy on admissions, essentially general and unwritten, is controlled and directed by the Admissions Committee. Essentially the policy at this point is to increase the number of undergraduates and not decrease the quality of the entering class. The undergraduate programs are, however, open only to women students.

The Admissions Committee works in consultation with other campus groups; for example, when the committee proposed dropping the SAT scores as one of the criteria for admissions, it consulted with the committee which was then concerned with curriculum.

Faculty load is still officially set at twelve credit hours each semester, but many faculty members actually carry nine-hour loads. There was one comment that loads should not only be limited to twelve hours but that they should not exceed three preparations. Another faculty member commented that loyalty to the Department and College "makes a person teach more," but the heavier loads are not mandatory.

Comprehensive examinations are not used at the College of New Rochelle; however, final examinations are "still on the books." If no examination is to be given, the faculty member is expected to report that information to the Registrar. Decision on policy relating to examinations was made at an earlier time by the CNR Faculty. Were such decisions to be made today, or altered, they would probably come from the Educational Policies Council.

There is no separate committee concerned with policy

formulation or its execution in the College Library. Matters in this area apparently would come to the attention of either the Educational Policies Council or the Academic Council.

Budgeting

Budget development originates in the office of the College treasurer. Requests for allocations are received from all parts of the College program. The academic area is the Dean's responsibility and he relies on the department chairmen for the appropriate identification of needs within a department. Tradition and experience play important roles in determining the proportionate elements in both the income and expenditures budget.

At a fairly early stage, and at regular intervals thereafter, the President of the College presents and discusses the proposed budget with the Finance and Development of Budget Committee. Consisting of representatives from the administration, faculty, and student body, this committee is described as advisory and was activated for the first time in 1971-1972.

The sessions were reported to be "somewhat open." Apparently the budget was reviewed in relatively broad categories with some of the details of the budget largely, and possibly appropriately, omitted.

The budget is finally transmitted to the Board of Trustees, where it is first reviewed and then recommended by the Finance Committee of the Board.

CHANGES IN THE PAST TEN YEARS

The change at the College of New Rochelle from a highly centralized administration to one including almost all of its constituent members has been gradual but very real and positive. The most significant evidence of change is all too apparent in the carefully planned and well-developed governance structure now in operation.

A change in the administrative structure was the appointment of the academic Dean as Provost of the College as of September, 1973. At the same time three deans were named for three programs: the undergraduate, the graduate, and "New Resources."

One example of the shift in the focus of authority is in the gradual development of the Faculty Committee on Rank, Tenure, and Salary. That particular committee had its modest beginning in 1958 with four appointed members plus the President and the Dean. It was totally advisory. By 1965 the composition of the committee had shifted to four elected members and two appointed members plus the President and the Dean. Still, the committee was strictly advisory. By 1970 all faculty members of the committee were elected and in 1973 it had six elected members plus the President (without vote) and the Provost (with vote). Today, the committee decides and the President either concurs or does not concur, a very different situation from a committee recommending or advising and then having a president actually decide.

Another shift of potential significance, yet untested, is the faculty and student membership on committees of the Board of Trustees. Another significant change is the budget review process which was opened to faculty and students in 1971-72. The key word in all of the CNR governance structure is "openness," created by expanded involvement in all aspects of decision making in the academic area.

CHAPTER IV

JUNIATA COLLEGE

Juniata College was established in 1876 by members of the Church of the Brethren "to fit students to meet the duties and responsibilities of life." The Brethren's Normal School and Collegiate Institute, as it was first known, was moved to its present site in Huntingdon, Pennsylvania, in 1879. Not until 1894 was the name changed to Juniata College.

To meet its stated purpose of preparing students for the responsibilities of life, Juniata College introduced a major revision in its curriculum in the Fall of 1971. Using a three-term calendar of approximately ten weeks each, the College requires thirty-four units of study for graduation. A unit may be a course or seminar or a direct experience of some sort, and a student generally registers for a three-course equivalency each term. A freshman is expected to take two units of *Modes of Thought and Methods of Inquiry*, one unit of *Freshman Seminar*, and one unit in the *Writing Program*. In addition, he takes six units of general education — two of *Human Existence—Historical* (freshman year), two of *Human Existence — Analytical* (senior year), and two in offerings designated as *Value Centered Units* (year not specified). In addition to these courses, a Juniata student must identify and complete a *Program of Emphasis*, which consists of fifteen units. These units may resemble more traditional courses or they may be student-designed in consultation with a faculty member and approved by the Academic Standards Committee. The total *Program of Emphasis* is planned in consultation with two advisers, one of whom apparently plays a role of major adviser. (There is reluctance, however, to use the terms major and minor advisers.)

Juniata offers several off-campus experiences for its students. Along with five colleges associated with the Church of the Brethren, Juniata participates in a project called Breth-

ren Colleges Abroad. These programs are located in Germany, France, and Spain. The College also takes part in the Drew University program on the United Nations and the American University project called The Washington Semester. These are all usually junior year projects. There is some expectation that the off-campus projects will be expanded as students devise work-experience units as part of their *Programs of Emphasis.*

In addition to the off-campus programs, the Juniata student has several other opportunities to arrange his studies with a fairly high degree of independence. These take such forms as credit by examination, tutorials, and independent studies.

The faculty at Juniata included 79 full-time persons in the Fall of 1972; 62 men and 17 women were in the group. Forty of the larger total, just about half, hold the Ph.D. degree; 38 hold the master's with 6 of these in areas where the master's degree is considered the terminal degree; and one holds the bachelor's as the highest degree.

In the Fall term of 1972, 1,207 students were registered. Of these, 1,187 were full time, and of that number, 719 were men and 468 women. The number of students by majors is not reported since that particular statistic has only limited meaning under the new curriculum with its *Programs of Emphasis.*

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Trustees

The bylaws of the Board of Trustees of Juniata in their latest form reaffirm the concept of a "coeducational liberal arts college." They also reaffirm the notion of no discrimination in "sex, religion, race, creed, or color" in the enrollment of students or in the selection and tenure of faculty, officers, and trustees.

The Board of Trustees numbers 30 plus the President of the College, ex officio. They select their own successors for three-year terms.

The bylaws list eight standing committees: Executive, Finance and Investments, Budget, Buildings and Grounds, Audit, Academic Affairs, Resource Development, and Nominating. Not appearing in the bylaws but nevertheless approved by the Board is a special arrangement which permits two faculty members and two students to participate in the deliberations (without vote) of six of the standing committees—all except the Committee on Audit and the Nominating Committee. The faculty members and students are elected by their own constituents. These twelve faculty members and twelve students in turn elect two of each group to serve on the Board itself, again as participants (more formally called "observers") but without vote.

The bylaws of the Board carry somewhat limited reference to matters of academic concern. The President is "responsible to the Trustees for the operation of the College," and he is one of the signers of diplomas. The Committee on Academic Affairs has its duties listed as follows:

(1) concern "with all matters pertaining to instruction, including actions on appointment and tenure of faculty,"

(2) concern "with the improvement of all resources for instruction and scholarship,"

(3) concern "with the interests of the faculty and students and with the well-being of the entire community,"

(4) recommendation "to the Board the candidates for degrees."

And, finally, in a proposed revision of the bylaws the suggestion is made that this committee in all of these functions "shall bear a special relationship to the Provost of the College for advice and consent in relation to his responsibilities as chief academic officer and as the officer of the College with responsibility for faculty and student affairs."

The bylaws of the College leave several matters unmentioned. While there are references to faculty members and to students, the references seem to point to them as individual persons and not as corporate groups. It seems clear that the President is responsible for the "operation" of the College. Whatever delegation of responsibility may be made to the faculty as a body is apparently done by the President and not by the Board—at least there is no reference to such matters in the bylaws of the Board. There is a suggestion of some delegation in the academic area in the bylaw reference to the appointment of the Provost and the Board relationship to him.

Faculty

The Faculty of Juniata functions as a corporate body with the Provost of the College serving as its presiding officer. The revision of its bylaws, now in process, suggests an effort to relate the duties and responsibilities of the faculty to the new curriculum of the College. The bylaws in their present form make some implicit assumptions about the role of the faculty. The nature of the committee structure gives support to those assumptions.

The Faculty committees are: Nominating, Executive, Personnel, Academic Standards, Academic Program, Academic Planning. Only the Nominating Committee has sole faculty membership. Otherwise, committees are composed of faculty members and students with occasional administrative membership ex officio.

The Executive Committee presided over by the Provost includes the chairmen of four of the faculty committees, two faculty members, and two students. All have voice and vote. The Personnel Committee was composed, until recently, of five elected tenured faculty members and two students—all with voice and vote. Effective in 1973-74, the committee will include six faculty members (tenure not required) and three students—all with voice and vote. This change was effected by faculty action, and it came in response to a student request for "parity" on the Board.

The Academic Standards Committee has five elected fac-

ulty members and five student members, all with vote. The Registrar and Director of Admissions, both without vote, serve in addition. This committee prepares policy for and oversees certification of the "academic" units. In addition, the committee is concerned with policy relating to admissions and grading, with recommending candidates for graduation, with reviewing individual cases involving policies of the Academic Standards Committee.

The Academic Program Committee is made up of five elected faculty members, two students—all with vote—and the Associate Dean of the College and the Registrar, both without vote. This committee reviews all student Programs of Emphasis, reviews unit offerings, and considers problems rising from the new Juniata undergraduate program.

The Academic Planning Committee is composed of five faculty members, two students, and the Provost of the College—all with voice and vote. The major effort is long range planning. "Generally the functions of the Academic Planning Committee include development, coordination, implementation, and evaluation of *policies* concerning the academic program."

Students

The students of Juniata College have only recently drafted and ratified a new "Constitution of the Juniata College Student Government." The preamble of their new constitution is of interest:

> As students, we believe it is necessary to provide for ourselves an organization to promote student voice and participation in the decision-making processes of the College. We further believe that such an organization is necessary to protect student interest and provide for ourselves certain services that are not or cannot be provided by the College or its agencies. Commensurate with these beliefs, we hereby establish the Juniata College Student Government.

The constitution clarifies student relationships to both

the Trustees and the faculty. Student participants in both groups are appointed by the president of Student Government subject to the approval of the Student Senate (the student legislative group). The constitution indicates quite specifically that "representatives" for the faculty committees are expected to report their actions to the Student Senate.

Several student leaders reported their greatest influence on the Faculty Committee on Academic Standards because they have "parity" on that committee. They expressed their greatest disappointment in their impact on the Faculty Personnel Committee; in that instance they had worked for "parity" but had had to settle for a revision to a 6-3 representation.

ACADEMIC DECISION MAKING

Faculty Personnel Area

Policy Development. Within the last two years there have been some shifts in policy relating to the qualifications of faculty members. While an emphasis on teaching and scholarship has had expression through the years, a new dimension, the potential ability to plan and teach effectively in the new General Education Program, has been added. Not only is the new candidate checked for his potential competence in his own discipline but he is checked for a broader competence in the program in General Education. This policy has a logical relationship to the latest curriculum developments at Juniata. Apparently the policy was developed at the administrative level, although doubtless there must have been a strong influence on policy from individual faculty members.

The College follows a policy of open recruitment for qualified faculty members. The openness extends to reviewing the credentials of personnel from a wide range of universities and to inviting leading candidates to the campus for extensive interviews. This policy grows out of administrative decisions.

Faculty promotions are made within the usual four-rank structure. The ranks themselves are defined in terms of earned degrees and years of teaching experience. The policy statements, while not neglecting quantitative measures, give rather heavy emphasis to the importance of superior quality in teaching and scholarship. The policy statement on promotion had both Faculty and Trustee endorsement.

Tenure policy was reported in line with the policy of the American Association of University Professors. A seventh year appointment clearly carries tenure with it unless the individual is notified to the contrary. In that event, the seventh year appointment is terminal. This policy, with modifications for the individual with prior teaching experience, has had approval by Faculty and Trustees.

Salary policy ties salary to rank and merit. The source of the policy, lost in history, apparently lies within the Administration.

The appointment of department chairmen on a three-year term is an administrative decision. The notion of faculty travel has faculty approval and administrative endorsement.

Implementation. The recruitment, selection, and appointment of new faculty members has its initiation with the Provost when he makes an actual determination that a position is to be filled. At this point, he advises the Council of Deans and the appropriate assistant dean. After consultation with department chairmen and specific consultation on the needs in General Education, the Assistant Dean initiates the process which eventually brings the two or three outstanding candidates to the campus for interviews. Present at these interviews are department chairmen and department members, the Assistant Dean from the appropriate division, the Associate Dean (for General Education), two additional faculty members chosen "at large," an "occasional" student, and always the Faculty Personnel Committee, which includes both faculty and students. Consensus is sought in making the decision; the Provost, however, has the final decision on the appointment of the new faculty member.

The promotion in rank of faculty members has its initiative with the Provost on his indication to the Faculty Personnel Committee of those faculty members who meet the minimum criteria in terms of earned degrees and time in rank. The committee, which consists of both faculty members and students, makes its recommendation directly to the Provost. In 1972-73 the committee was asked to limit its recommendations to three promotions only, even though this number was lower than the number of eligible faculty members based solely on quantitative items. The Council of Deans apparently reviews the recommendations which come from the Faculty Personnel Committee, and then the Provost, in consultation with the Council, makes his final decision, which he is empowered to transmit directly to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

The procedures for determining tenure move along many of the same channels as those for making decisions on promotion in rank. When tenure is to be decided, the Personnel Committee requests a random sampling evaluation from students in the classes of the faculty member who is being considered. These data along with full personnel forms go to the Personnel Committee, which forwards its recommendations to the Provost. Procedures at this point go along much the same as those for promotion in rank. There is some evidence that the Personnel Committee and the Council of Deans may not be always in agreement. In that case, the decision of the council carries appreciable weight even though it is apparent that the Provost makes the final decision. It might well be the Personnel Committee's decision would be a bit firmer if it were not for the fact that the Personnel Committee well knows that the Council and the Provost will take the more negative or "harder" line.

Tenure is a growing concern on the Juniata campus. In the current year only 43 per cent of the faculty is tenured; and no quota appears in present tenure policy. Six more persons are slated for tenure by the close of 1972-73, bringing the percentage to about 51.

Salaries for individual faculty members are determined

by the Provost. He consults with the Assistant Deans who in turn check with their respective department chairmen. He then makes his decision guided in large measure by the realities of the budget constraints. The Faculty Personnel Committee plays no role in the salary decision process.

In the selection of department chairmen, the Provost consults his Dean's Council for their individual and collective recommendations. The length of tenure for chairmen apparently varies and it would seem that the current policy does not mandate any effective rotation.

Faculty travel decisions are apparently made at the departmental level. An amount is budgeted annually, but there is no carryover from one year to the next.

Curriculum

Policy Development. General policies relating to curriculum lie with faculty. The new curriculum inaugurated in 1971 had its impetus in an ad hoc faculty committee. The changes in policy which were effected were all within the general framework of the Liberal Arts College. Final decisions were made by the Juniata faculty; at the same time it was reported that the Juniata Board of Trustees was kept fully informed. Many changes can be made in the implementation of policy by the Academic Standards Committee; apparently no higher authority is required.

Cooperative programs with other colleges, while requiring faculty and student involvement at the level of implementation, then become effective at the administrative level.

Any departure from the relatively well-established concept of curriculum within the guidelines of a liberal arts program would require action by the Juniata Board of Trustees.

Implementation. The major implementation of curriculum policy of recent years has been the effective development

of this new Program of General Education and Program of Emphasis. The actual implementation has had attention at many levels—administrative reorganization, faculty restructuring and development of new courses. Throughout the process active participation has been reported from all levels —faculty, administration, and students.

Instruction

Policy Development. A recently developed basic policy in admissions calls for increased efforts toward diversification of the student body. This particular policy, inspired by the Administration, suggests an effort to broaden Juniata's geographical and sociological areas of service.

Current faculty load calls for two units each term. It is understood that tutorials and independent study may actually be computed and included as part of the teaching load. Apparently the policy should more appropriately be considered an equivalency of two courses for each term. It must be assumed that time in advising will surely increase since each student has two advisers who assist him in assembling his Program of Emphasis.

The faculty set a policy of the student load of three concurrent "units" as part of its decision on the new curriculum. There is no uniform policy on final course examinations. Decisions apparently vary from professor to professor. Equivalency methods of evaluation must be approved by the Academic Standards Committee. To date there have been comprehensive examinations that apparently do not affect the student's graduation status.

Implementation. Implementation in the admissions area depends on the Office of the Director of Admissions. Deviations are a concern of the Academic Standards Committee.

Faculty load is controlled by the Dean's Council in which the respective Assistant Deans make final decisions on unit (or course) assignments and actual scheduling.

Student load is controlled by graduation requirements and effective advising.

Evaluation of faculty members by students is an essential part of the decision process which the Personnel Committee and Administration conduct on such items as selection, promotion, and tenure. The students are currently completing a course evaluation, course by course. This report was scheduled for May, 1973, publication.

Library policy is effectively executed by the appropriate administrative staff.

Budgeting

Budgeting in all of its aspects is an administrative responsibility. The chief business officer is the budget officer of the College. He has the task of securing the appropriate information from all elements of the College community. The academic and student personnel portions of the budget are developed in the Provost's office. The President is apparently responsible for setting budget guidelines and priorities. Only indirectly is there faculty and student influence in the process of budget development or in the final decisions relating to it. The budget eventually makes its way to the Board of Trustees. The committee in that body which considers the budget has both faculty and student membership. Usually the time element is such that the Board committee must severely limit its consideration of the budget.

CHANGES IN THE PAST TEN YEARS

The basic change at Juniata in the past ten years — and specifically in the past five years—has been the shift from a highly administratively-centered institution to one which may be increasingly described as cooperatively-centered. There has been a significant shift of authority from the office of the President to that of the Provost in the area of decision making in academic matters. At the same time the faculty has assumed a new and significant role in academic affairs

tempered in part at least by the more recent and growing involvement of students on several committees—and most significantly on the Faculty Personnel Committee.

At the time of these essentially internal developments, a new significant involvement has occurred: faculty and students on the Board of Trustees and its committees. This participation is recent and the full effects of both faculty and student participation have yet to be felt. In spite of the new involvement of faculty and students and the Provost's direct dealing with the Trustee Committee on Academic Affairs, the Board of Trustees continues to hold the President of the College accountable for all phases of academic administration. It will be interesting to note what changes if any in that relationship may occur in the next few years—as Trustees, Administration, Faculty, and Students settle into this new relationship.

CHAPTER V

KNOX COLLEGE

Established in 1837 in Galesburg, Illinois, Knox College states that its educational program is "characterized by tradition, tempered by flexibility and openness." Knox is a coeducational, private, independent liberal arts college. Its programs are directed toward majors in seventeen different academic departments, or in five interdisciplinary fields, or in an interdisciplinary area specifically devised to meet the student's "interests and capabilities."

In addition to the requirements in an area of concentration, the Knox student must demonstrate what is referred to as communicative literacy, quantitative literacy, historical literacy, and literacy in a foreign language. Beyond these requirements, each student must meet a distribution requirement of three courses in each of the three divisions—humanities, sciences, social sciences. One faculty member characterized Knox as a demanding liberal arts college with no "gimmicks." He emphasized, however, the high degree of flexibility in curriculum design.

Knox College is on the "3 - 3" calendar. Each student takes three courses each Fall, Winter, and Spring term; and must complete 36 courses for graduation.

Knox reports a full-time faculty of 93, 85 men and 8 women. Of this total, 72 per cent hold the Ph.D. There are two black faculty members.

In the Fall of 1972, 1,385 students were registered at Knox—56 per cent men and 44 per cent women. Of the total, 1,035 were Illinois residents; 333 were from other states, and 6 were from foreign countries. One student in 10 is from the city of Galesburg.

Many students were reported to have immediate professional interests. Probably only 50 per cent of the graduates

continue in graduate school or in a professional school. In 1971-72 there were five fields in which there were 20 or more graduates: Economics, English, Political Science, Psychology and Sociology. The Education department reported that 46 students had prepared for secondary teaching, 18 for elementary teaching, and 4 for K through 12.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Trustees

Knox College functions under a charter drafted originally in 1837 and amended as recently as 1968. The charter clearly shows that the Board has the power to "prescribe and regulate the course of study to be pursued . . . to appoint instructors, professors, and such other officers . . . to purchase books, equipment, materials and other suitable means of instruction." Any of these items may be delegated to the President and/or the Faculty.

The bylaws of the Board specify precisely the membership of the faculty and the ranks to be used; they state the following concerning the area of faculty responsibility:

1. Subject to action of the Board of Trustees from time to time, the academic ranks of teachers at Knox College shall be professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor. All teachers holding rank, together with the President, Deans, Registrar, and Librarian, shall be members of the faculty. No other member of the staff shall be a member of the faculty unless by action of the Board of Trustees he be given a faculty rank of instructor or above.

2. The faculty shall have the responsibility for regulation of educational policy concerned in the requirements of any degree in course authorized by the Board of Trustees. This responsibility includes such matters as standards of admission of students, curriculum, class attendance, grade reports, and the recommendations for degrees. The faculty shall also have supervision over disciplinary action and over student activities, including such matters as athletic eligibility,

extra-curricular activities, fraternities, sororities, and the social life of the students.[1]

The Knox Trustee bylaws state that the sessions of the Board are closed, but may be opened at the request of the Chairman of the Board or the President of the College. In fact, both faculty and students select representatives (one faculty member, and two students) to attend the regular Board sessions. The faculty and student members do not, however, attend the meetings of the Board committees.

Faculty

Faculty members holding the rank of instructor through professor constitute the organized faculty of Knox College. Its officers are the President of the College, the Dean of the College, the Dean of Students, the Associate Dean of Students, the Registrar, the Associate Dean of the College, the Presiding Officer of the Faculty, and the Secretary of the Faculty. The two latter officers are elected by the faculty. The Presiding Officer, a faculty member, actually presides only on invitation of the President or the Dean of the College. The President normally presides,[2] and the Dean is his usual substitute. Only the faculty members defined in the bylaws of the Board of Trustees may vote in faculty sessions.

Meetings of the Faculty are open as follows: five students specifically selected for this purpose, selected additional administrative officers whose presence is considered necessary by the President, and student members of those faculty committees which may have business to be presented.

The Faculty uses the following committees in the conduct of its business relating to academic governance:

(1) *The Executive Committee.* Its membership consists of the Dean of the College, the Dean of Students, six

---

[1] Charter and Bylaws, Knox College (Amended), pp. 35-36.

[2] Following the death of President Umbeck in May, 1973, practice has changed, and the sentence should now read: "At present, the Presiding Officer normally presides on the basis of a standing invitation from the Acting President."

other faculty members and two students; the Dean of the College serves as chairman. The committee coordinates the work of the standing committees, appoints the standing committees other than the Personnel Committee, prepares materials for faculty consideration, develops educational policies, and recommends on educational priorities in the total budget.

(2) *The Faculty Personnel Committee.* This committee consists of four elected faculty members, three of whom are representative of the three different divisions — Humanities, Social Studies, and Natural Science. There is no student membership. Its chief function is to act as advisory to the President on matters of promotion and tenure.

(3) *The Curriculum Committee.* The chairman of this committee is the Dean of the College. There are seven faculty members and two students. The task of this committee is to study curriculum problems, to consider all departmental changes, and to promote professional standards.

(4) *The Academic Affairs Committee.* This committee is chaired by the Associate Dean of the College. There are seven faculty members, two students, the Registrar (without vote) and the Dean of Students (without vote) on this committee. Its duties are to determine the academic status of students, act on selected exceptions to degree requirements, implement and administer the comprehensive exams and honors studies.

(5) *The Admissions Committee.* This committee has four faculty members and two students in its membership. The Dean of Admissions, the Director of Financial Assistance, and the Dean of Students are ex officio members of this committee which is basically advisory to the Dean of Students.

(6) *The Library Committee.* The membership of this committee includes five faculty members, two students, and the Librarian (ex officio). It serves as advisory to the Librarian and studies problems relating to the Library.

The student membership on these faculty committees is

scheduled as a function of the student government. Students apply, in a sense, for membership on these committees; are considered by the respective committees; and are then actually appointed by the committees. This entire process may change as the student government itself is completely revamped. For two years it has been inactive.

Students

Approximately two years ago, meaningful student government ceased operation on the Knox campus. The Student Affairs Committee of the Faculty, consisting of both the Dean of Students and the Associate Dean of Students (the latter without vote), four faculty members, and four students, assumed responsibility for the student activity and program budget. Many of the other activities of student government, such as selection for membership on Faculty committees, simply "fell by the wayside."

At this time, a new student constitution is being considered. Bearing a March 1973 date, a preliminary constitution went first to the Student Affairs Committee, thence to the Faculty, and later to the Students for their approval.[3] The constitution in its proposed form suggests a departure from the traditional approach with a singularly student emphasis. In contrast, it suggests a community-type approach. Were this document to be fully implemented, there would have to be extensive modification of current bylaws of the Knox Faculty and perhaps of the Knox Board of Trustees.

ACADEMIC DECISION MAKING

Faculty Personnel Area

Policy Development. The basic qualification of a faculty member is his holding of the highest appropriate degree. In addition, excellence in teaching, strength in scholarship, and aptitude in student advising are all considered important as

---

[3] Failed to pass a student referendum in 1973.

part of faculty qualifications. Apparently, these items of policy are the product of gradual administrative development and are not specifically the decision of any particular body.

A basic policy mandate relating to recruitment, selection, and appointment is the prior justification of need for the position. Here again is a policy which has been administratively developed. Policies governing procedures in the recruitment, selection, and appointment seem to be uniform, perhaps with a more vigorous initial role in the process played by the larger departments.

Promotion and tenure policy follow traditional lines, approved by the faculty and endorsed by the Trustees. Actual criteria are not delineated for the various ranks. However, official Knox policy calls for promotion from the rank of instructor to assistant professor by the end of six years, or dismissal from the faculty. The time requirements for tenure are quite specific: six years on the Knox faculty at the rank of instructor or above or three years at Knox if this period has been preceded by at least three years of teaching at another college. Knox has no fixed upper limit on percentage of faculty on tenure; currently that percentage is 55. That question along with other personnel questions is being studied by a special ad hoc faculty committee.

Guidelines on salary represent a range in salary of a $7,000 minimum to a $24,000 maximum for professors. Salary increases are also expected to accompany promotions in faculty rank. These are faculty-approved and trustee-endorsed items.

Department chairmen are appointed for six-year terms and may be reappointed. Their terms may not extend beyond age 62, by faculty decision.

Faculty travel is limited to those faculty members directly involved in professional meetings. This policy decision has grown out of the exigencies of the budget.

Implementation. The recruitment, selection, and appointment of new faculty members are initiated either within the

department or at the Dean's level. As many as four or five candidates may be invited to the campus for interviews before an appointment is actually offered. A decision is basically one of consensus, chiefly consensus between the department and the Dean. In actual fact, the President could exercise a veto of a selection; this would not, however, be a normal process. In that case, the department and the Dean would continue their exploration until consensus could be obtained.

In the matter of promotion and tenure, the Dean and the Faculty Personnel Committee develop their recommendations independently and then make their presentations to the President. Apparently, when there is agreement, the recommendation proceeds quite easily; if there is disagreement, consensus is attempted, but in the final analysis, the President's decision is final. The Personnel Committee reviews the status of all non-tenured faculty annually and of all tenured faculty every three years. The committee is expected to consider "quality of teaching, professional education, production of scholarly work, competence as a student adviser, duties as a member of committees, contributions to civic and other community organizations."

Decision making in the matter of faculty salaries is in the hands of the President and Dean, with the President having the final voice in the matter. While having no direct involvement in individual salary decisions, the Faculty Personnel Committee does make in the case of each faculty member a quite general recommendation as to "special merit raise," "average raise," or "no raise."

There is full faculty involvement in the selection of department chairmen. The implementation of policy on faculty professional travel is the Dean's responsibility.

Curriculum

Policy Development. The faculty of Knox College, within the framework of its principles of governance and within potential budget constraints, is responsible for final decisions

within the general area of curriculum. Policy calls for the initiation of change at the department level with the proposal moving through the Curriculum Committee and the Executive Committee and thence to the general faculty.

In the area of cooperative arrangements with other colleges, policy must have approval at the trustee level in addition to the faculty action.

Implementation. In practically every area of curriculum change the faculty has exercised a major role. Apparently, the initiation and major thrust for change come at the departmental level; however, there is opportunity for strong administrative leadership for change. A new cooperative program with Rush Medical College, which in 1973-74 is scheduled to involve ten students, was initiated by the administration. The program will reduce the total years of college and medical school by one year. This administrative proposal was approved by the faculties of the two schools and by the two boards of trustees.

The College has recently gone through a study and reorganization of its distribution requirements. In this instance, such committees as the Curriculum Committee and the Executive Committee channeled their recommendations for final action to the general Faculty.

Independent study, approved in principle by the Faculty, is implemented entirely at the departmental level.

Some faculty members indicated several times their belief that department strength was a major feature in most aspects of curriculum and instruction development at Knox College.

Instruction

Policy Development. Policy decisions regarding admissions and the composition of the student body appear to be made by administrative officers of the College. Although there are no absolute admissions criteria, in a given year there are guidelines based on class rank and board scores. When a special studies program was established to permit

students to use five years to complete the graduation requirements rather than four or even three, the Faculty voted to waive certain aspects of the admissions requirements in the case of certain "academically impoverished" individuals. The action enables the College to admit as members of this special program students whose usual academic indicators fall outside the relevant admissions criteria for a given year.

Faculty load is reported as seven courses during the three-term academic year—some type of 3-2-2-schedule. Apparently, most courses are scheduled to meet three 70-minute periods each week for a 10-week term with each course carrying 3⅓ semester hours of credit. Students normally carry three courses each term (nine each year) in order to meet graduation requirements within the usual four-year period. The policy of seven-course load has emerged in recent years and has not come about by a formal decision.

Guidelines on independent study are set at the department level. Apparently there is no provision for the inclusion of independent study as part of faculty load.

Policies relating to comprehensive examinations by major fields have recently been changed by faculty action. Only a few departments have continued the examination approach. A high percentage of the departments now offer a senior "comprehensive" seminar in lieu of the examination.

All guidelines relating to student evaluation are developed at the faculty level.

Implementation. The implementation of admissions policies is provided by the Admissions staff. Most of the items which relate to instruction — load, examinations, grading — are all implemented by the Faculty, particularly at the department level. For example, the department makes the decision to use the 70-minute period instead of the traditional 50-minute period, and the department decides whether to stay with the comprehensive examination or shift to the comprehensive seminar. It is the department, also, which initiates the evaluation process of faculty members as well as the evaluation of students.

Budgeting

The process of budget development rests almost entirely in the hands of the Administration. There is some involvement by faculty members at the department level; this is basically an expression of need in the area of such items as equipment and supplies. Academic salaries are treated separately from the department budgets: these requests are channeled through the Deans. There has been some discussion of involving the Executive Committee of the Faculty in the budget process, but this involvement has not materialized thus far.

CHANGES IN THE PAST TEN YEARS

While several of the committees of the faculty have remained unchanged in name during the past 10 years, they have undergone change in membership and have shown some shift in authority and role. The major change has been the selection of students for active membership on several of the faculty committees. The Faculty Personnel Committee, however, continues to be selected on the same criteria of the past twenty years, that is, without student membership. This particular committee is reported to be playing a much stronger role than it was in the early 1960s: its role continues to be advisory to the President and its general operations seem to be separate from but concurrent with the evaluation and recommendation procedures used by the Dean of the College.

Student selection and participation in committees is generally reported as of value by both faculty and students. A student applies for membership or a faculty committee, is interviewed and selected by members of the committee on which he serves. This method of selection assures an active interest on the part of the students and a high degree of compatability between the student and faculty members on the committees. This process, set by the Executive Committee of the Faculty, may change with the reorganization of the Student Government.

Another development of recent years which currently may have greater potential than actual realization is the involvement of both faculty members and students in the regular sessions of the Board of Trustees. This area of involvement is apparently limited to general sessions of the Board and has not been extended to the sessions of the standing committees of the Board.

In 1973 students who are department majors are scheduled to attend at least one monthly meeting of the department. The general reaction to this fairly new practice is an assurance of improved communication on a variety of curriculum and instructional matters.

A final change during the past ten years is the notion of budget involvement on the part of the Executive Committee. The faculty handbook carries this item on the responsibilities of this Committee: "to recommend educational priorities within the overall budget." There is some evidence that this faculty committee is still seeking ways in which to realize fully this area of its responsibilities.

CHAPTER VI

RANDOLPH-MACON WOMAN'S COLLEGE

Randolph-Macon Woman's College had its origin in 1891 as part of the Randolph-Macon system of educational institutions and became legally separate with the establishment of its own Board of Trustees in 1953. Randolph-Macon Woman's College has several claims in "firsts." Among these are that it is the first woman's college south of the Potomac to be granted a charter by Phi Beta Kappa and the first college for women admitted to the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

The curriculum of Randolph-Macon Woman's College has two major emphases: breadth of learning and depth of learning. The program guidelines are relatively flexible. To achieve breadth of learning the prospective graduate is advised to take a minimum of 12 semester courses (36 hours) including a specified minimum amount of work in writing, humanities and fine arts, natural sciences and mathematics, social sciences, and physical education. Another guideline which forces a breadth in registration is that each freshman must register in four departments each semester.

Depth of learning is emphasized in the 23 available departmental majors. In addition, Randolph-Macon offers as many as six interdepartmental majors. Further strengthening of the emphasis on depth of learning is found in such programs as independent study and honors courses. Several other approaches offer support to the total Randolph-Macon plan: Junior year programs provide for study at the University of Reading and the Inter-Collegiate Center for Classical Studies at Rome, and summer study at the Near Eastern Archaeological seminar and the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Randolph-Macon Woman's College also participates in a local three-college program and in a Vir-

ginia-North Carolina Student Exchange Program of eight colleges.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College uses the traditional two-semester calendar with the first semester completed before the Christmas vacation. The second semester begins fairly early in January and closes in early May. There is no short-term between semesters in the calendar. Since courses are weighted in terms of semester credit hours, the College sets its graduation requirements in those terms. Classes, however, meet for 60-minute periods and there is not a strict accounting of credit vis-à-vis the more traditional 50-minute period.

The faculty of Randolph-Macon Woman's College includes 65 persons, 33 men and 32 women, on full-time appointment. Of this total, 27 of the men and 19 of the women have the Ph.D. degree. A high percentage of those not holding the Ph.D. teach in the areas of physical education and in music, art, and dance.

In the Fall of 1972, RMWC registered 754 full-time students: 752 women and 2 men. There were 242 freshmen, 197 sophomores, 156 juniors, 154 seniors, and 5 unclassified.

The 1972 graduating class totaled 159. The six fields which had 10 or more graduates were biology, economics, English, history, politics and psychology. The Registrar's office reported 12 graduates in secondary education and six in elementary education.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Trustees

The Trustees of Randolph-Macon Woman's College, incorporated in 1952, may range in number from nine to thirty. They are elected for five-year terms.

The Board has the usual array of committees: Executive, Finance, Nominating, Development, Buildings and Grounds,

Administrative Salaries, and Committee on Committees. There is also a committee to meet with a special committee from the Faculty to discuss matters of mutual professional concern. Reports of these meetings are given at each Board meeting. A Student Affairs Committee performs a comparable function in terms of student relations.

The certificate of incorporation specifies that "neither the President of the College nor any member of the Faculty shall be a member of the Board." The President regularly attends Board meetings and appropriate committee sessions. Neither faculty members nor students attend board meetings. The Alumnae Association elects three alumnae as advisers to the Board. They, along with the President of the Alumnae Association and Dean of the College, attend but have no vote.

The certificate of incorporation includes as its first purpose the operation of the College "for the higher education and culture, primarily of women . . . in the liberal arts, languages, literature, sciences . . . without imposing or requiring any sectarian or denominational test for membership in the student body or faculty, or in the award of honors or degrees." In another section of the certificate of incorporation the Trustees are empowered to elect—and remove or suspend — the President, other officers of the College, and faculty members. There are no other references to the president and faculty nor are there other implied references to delegation of authority and responsibility in the conduct of the academic functions of the institution.

Faculty

The Faculty, as a corporate body, meets on the call of the President of the College, usually once a month. The Faculty Handbook describes the Faculty as the major legislative body dealing with issues of educational policies and procedures. Membership includes the President, the Dean of the College, the Dean of Students, the Dean of Admissions, all full-time "teaching" faculty holding the rank of instructor or above, and the professional library staff. Other officers of the Col-

lege may attend ex officio without vote. The President is the presiding officer, and a secretary is annually elected. There are no published bylaws. The Faculty does much of its business through a well-defined structure of College committees, which in the Spring of 1973 was undergoing some revision. Most of these committees have student members.

Following are those committees which touch most directly on academic governance:

The *Educational Policies Committee* is basically the curriculum committee of the College. Its agenda in this area may originate within the Committee or from outside—a department, a faculty member, or a member of the Administration. Its membership includes six faculty members (one of whom is chairman), the Dean of the College, and two students, who may bring items for the agenda, but only one student may vote.

The *Faculty Personnel Committee* is basically a policy committee, largely advisory to the Administration on matters of faculty personnel. Through a relatively long history it has refrained from direct involvement in decision making on promotion and tenure for individual faculty members; the committee members have been quoted as saying "the College is too small for this kind of thing." The Committee has been made up of three elected and three appointed members and the Dean of the College, with no student membership. The Committee has been naming its chairman. The one suggested revision in its structure is to make the membership entirely elected.

The *Admissions Committee* is responsible for providing policy guidelines for the "identification, encouragement, and selection of students for admission." In addition, the faculty members of the committee participate in the actual selection of those candidates about whom questions may have been raised by the Admissions staff. The Committee is chaired by the Dean of Admissions, and the membership includes the Dean of Students, four faculty members, and four students.

The suggested revision in the committee membership will increase the number of faculty members to six.

The *Faculty-Trustee Committee*, discussed in an earlier section, will in its suggested revision include six faculty members as before but will be composed of one member selected from each of the six designated major committees of the faculty.

The *Library Committee*, with limited policy responsibilities for the Library, works under a new Committee on Instructional Materials. The membership includes six faculty members, the Dean of the College, and two students.

In the present structure, a unit called the College Council has an inclusive membership and provides an important forum for the discussion of almost any aspect of the life of the College by members of the student body, faculty, and administration. Two proposed committees are a Planning Committee and a Committee on Professional Development. Both of these include academic elements which, if adopted, will affect aspects of the governance structure.

Students

Members of the Randolph-Macon Woman's College student body are all members of the Student Government Association. Several features of the student government structure should be noted.

The *Judiciary Committee* considers cases brought to trial under the RMWC Honor Principle and occasionally hears a case referred to it by a lower "court" or appealed by the student involved. Membership includes the chairperson of the Judiciary Committee, the president of the Student Government, three representatives from the three upper classes elected by each respective class at large, the President and the Dean of the College, the Dean of Students, and one faculty member elected annually.

The *Dorm Presidents' Council*, composed of the presidents of the six dormitories, the chairperson of the Judiciary

Committee, the Dean of Students, and the Head of Hall of each student under consideration, has jurisdiction over cases involving infractions of social and dormitory regulations and campus conduct not involving dishonesty.

The *Curriculum Committee* is concerned with the intellectual life and curriculum interests of students. The assistant chairman of this committee is designated as the student representative to the Faculty Educational Policies Committee, making a liaison between these two committees which have similar interests and concerns.

The *Admissions Committee* is charged with working with the Admissions office "for the effective recruitment of prospective students." The members of this student committee serve as the student members of the College Admissions Committee. Here is another aspect of coordination in administrative procedures.

The *Student Government Association*, as previously noted, assumes under the Honor Code the administration of final examinations. An *Examinations Scheduling Committee* is in charge of the procedures. Its chairperson is selected by the outgoing chairperson, the President of Student Government, and the Dean of the College. Membership on this committee is allocated on a dormitory basis.

Using a *Student Budget Committee*, the Student Government develops and controls a total annual budget of about $35,000.

ACADEMIC DECISION MAKING

Faculty Personnel Areas

Policy Development. Appointment to the Faculty of Randolph-Macon Woman's College may be made for five successive one-year periods at the instructor level and for two-year and three-year terms at the professorial level. Unless otherwise stipulated, appointment beyond five years car-

ries with it tenure in the College. Adopted by the RMWC Faculty in 1954, the terms of appointment and of tenure were slightly amended in 1967.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College, by Faculty action of several years ago, has delineated its criteria for faculty rank in specific terms of earned degrees or their equivalents and in more general terms relating to such items as "successful teaching experience, sound scholarship, continued professional development." The criteria do not specify time in rank; in fact, the guidelines emphasize "achievement and promise rather than length of service."

For approximately 20 years, Randolph-Macon Woman's College has had a Faculty Personnel Committee. The Faculty has been steadfast in strictly limiting the functions of this committee to areas of policy development with no role in policy execution.

Department chairmen are named for three-year terms by the President and Dean in concert. There is no vigorous policy calling for rotating department chairmen; in fact, chairmen have been reappointed for several terms. The policy of the three-year term for department chairmen was made by the Faculty.

Faculty professional travel is encouraged as a matter of policy. Faculty members may spend up to $200 in a two-year period. Humanities and summer grant programs supplement this amount.

Implementation. The implementation of promotion and tenure policy proceeds without consideration by a faculty committee. Procedures are initiated at the department level; recommendations are forwarded to the Dean of the College. The President makes the final decision on individual promotions upon recommendations of the Dean.

The policy on tenure is administered in somewhat the same way, with the President having the ultimate decision

following consultation with the Dean. Apparently, faculty members who are not on tenure may be reappointed even though their probationary period has expired. One instance of extended appointment of a full-time faculty member, non-tenured at the rank of instructor, was reported. Currently, administration of the tenure policy has been halted while a special faculty committee studies the situation. This tenure problem and the moratorium on implementation were reported to the Board of Trustees in January, 1973; and at the same time, the President reviewed the situation with the Faculty Personnel Committee. In the Spring of 1972-73, RMWC reported about 65 per cent of its full-time faculty on tenured appointments. The obvious impending expansion of this proportion gave rise to the necessity of appointing an ad hoc Committee on Tenure. This committee is expected to avoid the recommendation of a rigid quota, but it will probably stress superior qualifications and some regard for tenure patterns within departments. There may be some move toward direct faculty involvement in policy execution.

Within the framework of budget constraints, the President and Dean together make decisions on the salaries of individual faculty members. They already have fairly extensive information on those faculty members being considered for promotion and tenure. In addition, department chairmen are asked to provide for all salary recommendations of a rather general nature—average or normal raise, special attention for the extremely meritorious, or less than average for the less able.

The recruitment, selection, and appointment process invariably includes bringing one or more candidates to the campus for interviews. The initiation of the recruitment process lies with the Dean in those instances when the vacancy occurs in a small department; in the large departments the chairman may move ahead after some general clearance of plans with the Dean. A candidate is subjected to a number of interviews. In many instances students are included in the process; majors in a department often have lunch with a candidate.

Although the President actually appoints department chairmen to their positions, he regularly requests advice from the members of the department. Chairmen tend to remain in office beyond a single three-year term.

Within the budget allowance set by policy, the faculty member makes his own decision on his professional travel plans, subject to approval by the Dean of the College.

Curriculum

Policy Development. The Faculty of Randolph-Macon Woman's College is clearly the decision-making body on matters pertaining to curriculum. There are, however, rather severe budget constraints which are bound to affect curriculum development. There are also the guidelines of what the faculty will acknowledge as a "liberal arts curriculum of high quality." A clearly understood budget constraint is a mandate of no expansion of faculty personnel resulting from curriculum development or expansion.

Policy relating to cooperative college programs may have faculty or student influence at an initial stage. Final decisions, however, are determined at the top administrative level. Randolph-Macon Woman's College now participates in two consortia. One comprises three colleges in the Lynchburg area; the other consists of student exchanges with several other colleges in Virginia and one in North Carolina.

Implementation. Suggestions for curriculum change come from several sources. A number of students emphasized the value and importance of student contributions to changes in curriculum. They reported their influence on curriculum in the Spring of 1970—a time when students on many campuses were raising questions about the relevancy of their college courses and programs.

New courses may be implemented by initiation from a department or a faculty member, routed through the Educational Policies Committee for the consideration of its educational implications, then to the Faculty for action. Again budget constraints become operative either in approving a

course with limitations or in requiring a department to choose between offering a new course as an overload for one or more of its faculty members or dropping an existing course. While the influence of the Educational Policies Committee comes basically from the faculty, one student and the Dean of the College serve on this committee.

Instruction

Policy Development. Basic policy relating to the composition of the student body is administratively determined. Admissions policy is apparently influenced by the faculty portion of the Admissions Committee; there is, nevertheless, an impression of administrative dominance of admissions policy.

The ceiling of a faculty load is generally twelve hours each semester. In non-laboratory courses credit hours exceed clock contact hours; in laboratory courses contact hours are the basis for computing loads. One faculty member indicated that while some persons might on occasion carry a heavier load (presumably in order to introduce a new course), no one was required to teach more than twelve hours. The load of a faculty member is in part self-determined and in part set by the department chairman. The guideline of a maximum of twelve hours is followed quite carefully.

Faculty evaluation by students has been voted down by the Faculty itself. There is, however, a growing recognition of the value of faculty evaluation by students and its inevitability. Some faculty members now make a limited use of evaluation by students.

A final course examination or its equivalent is normally given in each course at the end of each semester. All students are required to take these examinations.

Implementation. All policies which govern admissions, as well as the composition of the student body, are executed by the Dean of Admissions and his staff. Exceptions in admissions must be looked at by the faculty members of the Admissions Committee.

Final examinations are not required in all courses. The faculty member not giving an examination is expected to report to the Dean what equivalency is required in each course. It is a matter of interest to report that the entire final examination program is administered by the Student Government. Each student takes her examination under the Honor Code, and the examinations are, in fact, actually self-scheduled. It is possible in this way for different students in a course examination to take their examinations over a period of six to eight days.

Budgeting

The development of the budget of Randolph-Macon Woman's College is almost entirely an administrative function. Initiated in the business office, the budget includes the stated requirements from the several areas of administration. In the academic area, estimates of need in such items as supplies and equipment are channeled from the department chairmen to the office of the Dean. Final review and approval of the budget rest in the office of the President. It then goes to the Board of Trustees and its appropriate committees. The major influence in budget development is essentially administrative.

CHANGES IN THE PAST TEN YEARS

During the past ten years at Randolph-Macon Woman's College there has been a gradual shift toward greater faculty involvement in the academic decision-making process. In line with this apparent shift, a special faculty committee has drafted a new committee structure in order to expedite its business. On the other hand, the faculty does not have a charter and bylaws which would clearly describe its general scope of authority and responsibility. There is apparent, however, a large measure of authority and responsibility both in the old committee structure and in the new one being currently considered.

Further evidence of a growing faculty involvement and possible assertion of leadership is in the selection of one of its own members as chairman in both the Educational Policies Committee and the Faculty Personnel Committee. The Dean of the College continues to hold ex officio membership on the committees but is no longer the chairman.

The Faculty, however, continues to limit its Personnel Committee to policy development only, and is still unwilling to assign it any role in decision making on individual instances of promotion and tenure.

Along with an apparent growth in faculty involvement in academic governance, there has been an increase in student involvement. Their membership on several college committees is one symptom of this particular change in climate. Student administration of the self-scheduled final examination process suggests a significant level of student responsibility and maturity. The Honor Code itself, not new at Randolph-Macon, continues to have force and significance in the RMWC tradition.

With this increase in faculty and student involvement, there is, however, no apparent diminution in the authority and responsibility of the President and the Dean. That the report on the restructuring of faculty committees was to be made directly to the President is, in a sense, indicative of strength in that office. The decision on a freeze in tenure is a further indication of the exercise of presidential authority. The significant development at Randolph-Macon Woman's College is the growing sense of the need for involvement of both faculty and students in the academic areas.

CHAPTER VII

REGIS COLLEGE

Regis College, the successor to Las Vegas College, established in 1877 by a group of Jesuits from Naples, Italy, and of Sacred Heart College, established in 1888 in Denver, assumed a new entity and a new name in 1921 under the auspices of the Missouri Province of the Society of Jesus. Established as a men's college, Regis reached another major milestone when it changed to a coeducational institution in 1968.

Its program emphasis in the 1970s is in the liberal arts, with professional programs in business and teacher education. Approximately 40 per cent of the Regis graduates continue in some type of post-baccalaureate professional or graduate program.

In the fall of 1972, Regis registered 1,127 full-time and 203 part-time students. Of these 1,330 students, 876 (65.8 per cent) were men and 454 (34.2 per cent) were women. Of this total of 1,330 students, 736 lived in college dormitories—442 men and 294 women. The day enrollment totaled 1,219; the evening enrollment amounted to 111.

Regis reported in the Fall of 1972 a total faculty of 84 persons—60 men and 24 women. Among the 84 faculty members were 62 lay persons and 22 Jesuits. Four of the total of 84 represented minority groups. Thirty-three faculty members (or 36 per cent) held the Ph.D. degree.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The major constituent groups which comprise the Regis community are the trustees, faculty and students. A brief description of each of these components follows.

Trustees

The bylaws of the Regis Educational Corporation,

adopted in November, 1972, call for a Board of Trustees ranging in size from five to twenty-one, a majority of whom are Jesuits. The Corporation is responsible for the operation of both Regis College and Regis High School. While all of the powers of the corporation bear on phases of administration—and specifically the traditional ones touching on business operations — the following powers deal a bit more directly on academic governance.

(a) Determine the fundamental policies of the Corporation; establish educational objectives and approve the basic operating policies which flow from these objectives,

(b) Approve all additions or deletions of academic programs of the Corporation,

(c) Review and take appropriate action with respect to the budget, which shall be submitted to it upon recommendation of the President,

(d) Approve the appointment of all chief operating executives and administrators of the Corporation, such as for Business and Finance, College Academic Affairs, College Student Affairs, Development, and for the High School.[1]

The bylaws make only passing reference to the faculty and students of the College. In the preamble of the bylaws are the following references.[2]

> 'to encourage learning . . . ' as accommodated to the needs of the times and its *students*, . . . to conjoin with its academic programs opportunities for *faculties* and *students* to integrate in their lives the knowledge they can assimilate from our total developing culture, from the knowledge derivable from religious experience, as well as knowledge gleaned from humanistic, scientific and other learning.[3]

---

[1] These powers appear as c, d, e, and f. on p. 3 of bylaws adopted November 17, 1972.

[2] Underlinings added by investigator.

[3] Footnote, Article I, Preamble, Bylaws, Adopted November 17, 1972, p. 1.

The preamble carries one other reference to teaching-learning in the statement that "the Corporation adheres to established principles of *academic freedom*," and "strives to provide a form of education at once personal and appropriate to the evolving civilization in which its *students* find themselves."[4]

In addition to the Board of Trustees, there is currently a Board of Regents which is composed of laymen and serves in an advisory capacity to the President and Board. While the present ten-member Board of Trustees is made up entirely of Jesuits (7 local, 3 from other Jesuit institutions and provinces), the expanded Board will include lay persons.

The Board functions at present as a single committee of the whole, without the customary committee structure of most boards of trustees. The new constitution calls for the creation of a strong Executive Committee; plans are currently being made for adding other committees of the Board.

As the Board is expanded there will be no faculty membership, in either a voting or non-voting capacity. There is no plan at this point in the life of the College to include students on the Board in any capacity.

Faculty

The faculty reorganized itself in September 1972 under the "Constitution of the Regis College Assembly." All full-time faculty members hold membership in the Assembly, and after one year's appointment may hold office. Bylaws are being developed. In its preamble, the Assembly affirms that it serves as "the composite voice of the Faculty," recommending to the President.

A number of College committees have been appointed. These with rare exception include faculty members, appropriate administrators and students. Student committee mem-

---

[4] *Ibid.*

bers vote in all instances except in the Rank and Tenure Committee.

A number of College committees with varying degrees of activities and responsibilities were reported. Those particularly active in various phases of academic governance were:

(1) Educational Policies Committee — 5 division directors, 2 faculty at large, and 4 students chosen by Student Government. Designed to recommend changes in curriculum.

(2) Rank and Tenure Committee — 5 faculty members and 2 students (one of whom is the President of Student Government). Designed to recommend on faculty promotions and tenure.

(3) Budget Committee — 3 administrators, 4 faculty members, and 2 students (1 of whom is treasurer of Student Government). Designed to review and recommend items in the annual budget.

(4) Educational Planning Committee — chaired by the Dean. Members include 1 other administrator, 8 faculty members, and 1 student. Designed to participate in long range educational planning.

(5) Admissions Committee—chaired by the Director of Admissions. Members include 1 other administrator, 4 faculty members, and 2 students. Designed to implement admissions policy.

The American Association of University Professors has organized the Faculty of Regis College for the purposes of collective bargaining. The determining election was held in January, 1973, and negotiations were underway in April. The plan stated at that time was for a relatively simple basic contract to include a revised faculty handbook which detailed conditions of faculty service. Negotiations were satisfactorily concluded in October, 1973.

Students

The students function under a relatively highly struc-

tured form of governance. Their constitution and bylaws indicate a control of their own budget and their own campus life and activities.

The constitution of the Regis College Student Senate provides for a legislative body, an executive branch, and a judicial board.

The constitution also provides for several standing committees. They are (1) the Organizational Review Committee, (2) the Election Board, (3) the Finance Committee, (4) the College Relations Committee, (5) the Social Committee, (6) the Community Relations Committee, (7) the President's Advisory Council. With the exception of the President's Advisory Council all committee members are named by the committee chairmen who have been directly elected by the Student Senate. Apparently, all positions are held by students. The constitution provides for proportionate representation from resident and commuting students.

Student participation on College committees, while extensive, has had its limitations. One student suggested that the extent of student functioning was in direct relationship to faculty involvement; several students thought faculty were unwilling to act at times because "they were hung up on tradition."

ACADEMIC DECISION MAKING

Faculty Personnel Area

Policy Development. With successful conclusion of the bargaining negotiations, the faculty has now taken a more active role in developing policy, especially for the areas of teaching and in matters of faculty personnel policies. The forthcoming edition of the faculty handbook reflects this development.

Policy in faculty personnel, in recent years, has had strong administrative direction from the offices of both the

President and the Dean. During this period policy has shifted back and forth between the two offices. In addition, action of the Trustees in this area of policy has, reportedly, been supportive of action of the Administration.

There was general recognition of the fact that the execution of policy may itself create the need for policy revision and, in fact, may lead to the creation of new policy.

Policies relating to selection and appointment, to promotion, and to tenure are based on AAUP guidelines. These policies are outlined in the 1967 edition of the Regis faculty handbook, and are now undergoing revision. These policies can be changed by Administrative and Board action.

Tenure policy now calls for a decision before appointment for the seventh year. There is, however, no policy restricting the number or proportions of faculty on tenure. Approximately half of the faculty are now on tenure. One officer indicated that if present practices continue in effect, practically every faculty member would hold tenure in five years.

The policy statement on faculty rank shows progressively greater expectations, both quantitatively and qualitatively, as one moves from instructor to assistant professor to associate professor and to professor. The initial rank is classified as on an annual appointment basis, not a tenured rank. The top three ranks, while progressively demanding, show appropriate flexibility on various criteria. Flexibility appears in such wording as "ordinary" and "normally." The doctorate is never spelled out as mandatory in the top three ranks; however, the exceptions are those instances when some other advanced degree is deemed more appropriate.

In the policy area of recruitment, selection, and appointment of faculty, the faculty members who commented tended to emphasize guidelines requiring initiation of procedures at the department level. In contrast, Administrators seemed to emphasize guidelines which put the initiation of effort at the

Dean's level of operation. Policy relating to salaries seems to be clearly placed in the President's office.

Regis College has both Department Chairmen and Division Directors. The chairmen are appointed by the Dean and the directors are elected by their respective divisions.

Faculty travel is encouraged as a feature of personnel policy.

Implementation. In the execution of policy relating to tenure, promotion in rank, and salary determination, initial steps usually occur at the department level with the self-evaluation prepared by the faculty member himself. At an intermediate level in the decision process the Rank and Tenure Committee develops and reports its opinion. This committee is comprised of five faculty members and two students. The committee is chaired by one of the faculty members. The two students who have no vote include the Student Senate president and one senior student elected by the students.

The Rank and Tenure Committee can make precise recommendations in the areas of promotion in rank and in tenure. On the matter of salaries, however, the committee is expected to recommend salary increases in three major categories for each faculty member: above average, average, and below average. In other words, the committee does not make specific recommendations on actual salaries for individual faculty members.

The final decision on these particular personnel items moves through the office of the Dean to the desk of the President. His decision is final; it is, however, confirmed by action of the Board of Trustees.

The initial recruitment of new faculty members as well as the initial procedures on selection and appointment of new faculty members lies with either the department chairman or the Dean; the final decision is made by the Dean.

Decisions concerning the allocation of funds for faculty travel are made by the Faculty Development Committee.

Curriculum

Policy Development. Major changes in the area of curriculum are referred as a matter of policy to the Board of Trustees. General policy assigns decision relating to minor items in curriculum to the Educational Policies Committee and to the Dean. Policy can be initiated at several levels. All major policy decisions include participation at the presidential level after prior exploration by the Educational Policies Committee.

Flexibility in curriculum development is provided by permitting departments to offer a course on an experimental basis three times before the department has to secure approval on a "permanent" basis.

Implementation. The implementation of curriculum policy tends to follow guidelines indicated. At a major level, implementation moves through departments, thence to the Dean and President, and on to the Board of Trustees. At a minor level, the simple adding of a course, for example, involves first the department and then the Dean. In the case of a course deletion, the department chairman makes the final decision.

The Educational Policies Committee serves as an interpreter of policy in matters of an immediate nature, but by and large its chief function is in long range planning.

Instruction

Policy Development. All policy development relating to the composition of the student body is made at the top administrative level. For example, a decision as major as the recent change from a men's college to a coeducational college was made at this top administrative level. It should be noted, however, that this decision was essentially a Trustee decision in view of the high degree of duplication of personnel in the administrative staff and on the Board of Trustees.

Policy relating to admissions seems to be a responsibility of the Admissions Committee. In view of the recent shifting of the administration of admissions to the President's Office, one might conclude that there is a direct administrative influence on admissions policy.

Policy relating to teaching load calls for 12 credit hours of instruction a semester. In the sciences the contact hour is apparently given some weighting in the assignment of load. Released time for special tasks can be arranged by the Dean. Any change in this policy would require some action on the part of the Faculty Assembly with final approval in the President's office.

Policy on student evaluation has undergone recent change. To permit an added refinement in grading, the College has recently added C+ to the traditional letter-grade scale. Decisions of this nature are made by the Educational Policies Committee.

Policy concerning course examinations and comprehensive examinations is finally determined by the Educational Policies Committee. The policy calls for the use of instructor-made final examinations in courses and the use of the Undergraduate Record Examination as the major comprehensive examination.

Policies relating to the college library are administratively developed.

Implementation. Except for the administration of the Admissions office, now a direct concern of the President's office, final responsibility for the execution of the other items in the instructional area rests with the Dean's office.

Initial recommendations on class scheduling come from the department to the Dean's office. This office not only coordinates the scheduling but also "supervises" the extent of conformity to the 12-hour load policy of full-time faculty members.

As another example, the Dean's office schedules final and comprehensive examinations and is thereby in a position to note, in another instance, the extent of conformity with college policy.

Budgeting

Budget development in the College calls for an early request to the departments from the Director of Business and Finance. Each academic department is asked for an estimate of its needs for a two-year period. This estimate excludes amounts for faculty salaries. The total budget is reviewed by a special Budget Committee, which is advisory to the President. The committee, chaired by the Director of Business and Finance, includes two administrators—the Assistant Academic Dean and the Dean of Students, four faculty members (one each from the four divisions), and two students, one who is treasurer of the Student Government and the other elected by the students. The committee's work in April, 1973, was restricted to supplementary budget decisions.

CHANGES IN THE PAST TEN YEARS

The most significant change of the past ten years has been the shift from a largely centralized regime directed by the Jesuits and the Missouri Province to a somewhat more open governance structure. The new constitution of the Corporation still provides for Jesuit control but it is by no means absolute nor is it restricted to Jesuit local trusteeship. Ten years ago, Regis College had an advisory council consisting of local civic and business leaders. Today, the same type of group exists but is now known as a Board of Regents.

While there is no provision for either faculty or student participation in sessions of the Board of Trustees, there are many opportunities for faculty and student involvement in committees that represent a wide range of academic con-

cerns. Several of these are advisory on matters directly relating to aspects of academic governance. Several groups suggested that the involvement of the following committees was most significant: Budget Committee, Rank and Tenure, Educational Policies, and Educational Planning. The first and last included administrators, faculty members, and students; the second and third committees included faculty and students. The students were able to vote on all committees except the Committee on Rank and Tenure. Some students suggested, however, that the entire committee structure should be reassessed.

In addition to change in structure of the Regis Corporation, other changes were in process stemming from the collective bargaining negotiations. At the time of the campus visit these directions were unclear. It now seems evident that the successful conclusion of negotiations has established a positive effect on the processes of decision making in academic governance.

CHAPTER VIII

SOUTHWESTERN AT MEMPHIS

Southwestern At Memphis, founded in 1848 and located in Memphis since 1925, offers a program emphasis in the liberal arts. Its long relationship with the Presbyterian Church in the United States is evidenced by board membership drawn from four Presbyterian synods; in addition, the city of Memphis is "represented" on the board by a group of local members elected by the board itself.

In the Fall of 1972 the College reported an opening enrollment of 1,090 students and a faculty of about 80. A majority of the students live on campus; those not on campus are residents of Memphis. With many faculty members holding long tenure, the turnover of faculty has been low.

The liberal arts curriculum has many traditional emphases. Although there is no major in education, professional courses leading to certification in secondary education have long been available and in elementary education since 1972. A calendar of two long terms plus a short Spring term provides flexibility in scheduling and course development. Programming under "directed inquiry"[1] gives even greater flexibility.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

There are three corporate groups at Southwestern, all of which have some element of authority in academic governance. These are the Board of Trustees, which is the legal governing body of the College; the Faculty of the College; and the Student Body Government.

Trustees

The Board's bylaws emphasize the role of the Board in

---

[1] A type of flexible independent study agreed on by a student and professor; may be a laboratory experiment, special readings on a given topic, some type of art work, a group of essays. See pp. 57-58, *The Bulletin of Southwestern At Memphis*, 1972-1973.

these words: "As provided by the charter, the administration of the affairs of this institution shall be supremely and solely in the hands of its said Board of Trustees." In theory, then, both the Faculty and Student Body exist by authorization of the Board of Trustees with their roles defined rather clearly. The authority and responsibilities conferred on these two groups have tended to become fixed and irreducible.

The Board of Trustees, as recently as the Spring of 1972, made provision for faculty and student participation on a non-voting basis in its deliberations. Three faculty members and three students are selected by the Chairman of the Board and, in turn, elected by the Board for a one-year term. The choices are made from six member slates elected by the respective groups. The process mandates the choice of at least one woman in each group.

The Board has also provided for faculty and student membership on the majority of its standing committees. In addition, the Board selects faculty members and students to serve as participants in regular Board sessions.

Membership on the Executive Committee and Nominating Committee is restricted to voting board members. The Investment Committee is composed of the Chairman of the Board, the President, and the Treasurer of the College, and three to five non-Board members drawn from the banking and business community. Faculty and students do not serve on these three committees, but do serve on these standing committees of the Board:

Committee	Trustees	Faculty	Students
Finance	7	2	2
Faculty	7	5	1
Students	7	3	3
Development and Institutional Advancement	7	2	2
Buildings and Grounds	5	2	2
Honorary Degrees	3	2	1

Faculty

Just as the Board of Trustees has opened its doors to faculty and students, the Faculty has opened its membership and committees to student participation. Nine students, without voting privileges, are "admitted to Faculty meetings." These include four student government officers and student representatives from five Faculty standing committees. Not all Faculty standing committees have student representatives. The Faculty Professional Interests Committee, for example, not only has no student members but also excludes the President and Dean, who are listed as ex officio members of all other Faculty committees.

The standing committees which report no student participation are the Committee on Committees, Library, Research and Creative Activity, and Special Studies. Those standing committees which include student members are:

Administrative Policy: 2 students
Admissions and Student Financial Aid: 2 students
Athletics: 3 students
Community Life: 7 students
Curriculum, *Standards*, and *Standing:* 3 students
Educational Development: 5 students
Freshman Program: 2 students

Students

The Student Body Government includes a variety of boards, councils, commissions, and committees. These groups directly affect the academic and social life of students. There is no administration, faculty, or trustee membership in any of these groups. Members of the administration and faculty become involved when and if there are appeals from students.

One of the constituent groups in the Student Government Association is the Honor Council. The Honor System at Southwestern functions under its own constitution. Council members, with equal numbers of men and women, are elected annually from each of the four classes in the student body.

The President and Vice President of the Honor Council are elected by the student body at large. Appeals go to the Dean and thence to a specially appointed faculty committee. Violations of the Honor Code "include lying in official matters, cheating, stealing, and failing to report violations." (See p. 7, *The Honor System*, Southwestern At Memphis, 1971-1972.) Southwestern's Honor Code, which began in the nineteenth century, is an important part of college life today.

ACADEMIC DECISION MAKING

Faculty Personnel Area

Policy Development. Policy development in the faculty personnel area seems to be clearly an administrative responsibility which is currently exercised by the Dean. Policy has undergone few changes in recent years. One notable change has been a recent reduction in the retirement age for faculty members, from 70 to 65, effective for new appointees only. In this instance, the Dean, after extended consultation, made the effective decision with final confirmation given by the Board of Trustees.

While faculty members emphasized the administration's general dominance of the faculty policy area, they did state their belief in faculty responsibility on the item of tenure policy. They cited also the action of a faculty committee in the recent development of a policy statement on the employment of women. This latter statement, strangely enough, was sent directly to a committee of the Board of Trustees, bypassing the faculty. In this instance, this faculty committee was apparently functioning in a staff relationship to the Dean rather than as a faculty committee. In a sense, then, this decision can be considered as administrative, not faculty. At least this was the rationale given by the faculty members for not sending their recommendation *through* the faculty.

It should be noted, however, that a theoretical possibility for the involvement of both faculty and students in the faculty personnel area does exist. This involvement could exist at the trustee level, specifically through faculty and student

membership on board committees and on the board itself. Presumably these two constituencies, without vote, are in a position to have some influence on trustee actions growing out of administrative level recommendations.

Policy decisions in many of the faculty personnel areas have not been formalized but have grown out of the direct experience of the various Southwestern administrators.

Implementation. The strong administrative dominance which is reported in the faculty personnel area is not quite so apparent in the direct execution of policy. While the Dean plays a major role in implementation, a collegial kind of approach was reported at all steps in policy execution.

Apparently in the recruitment, selection, and appointment of new faculty members the initiation for action comes from the department, with a final decision on appointment being shared by the department and the Dean. In the case of a relatively small department or one with members of limited experience, the Dean apparently exercises a more dominant role, possibly both in initiating the process and in serving as the final decision maker on the appointment.

Much the same kind of process is followed in decision making on faculty promotion. No written policy was reported about time in rank. Actual execution of policy, however, was reportedly based on guidelines suggesting five years in the rank of assistant professor and seven years — or age forty—for time in the rank of associate professor. In the instance of promotion, the process is routinely originated with the department and brought to a final decision by the Dean.

When the time comes for a decision on tenure (the policy calls for a decision at the end of five years), the Dean seeks the recommendation of the appropriate department chairman, who is expected in turn to consult with his tenured colleagues. Once this advice has been secured, the Dean makes his recommendation. Guidelines set no limits on num-

bers or percentage of faculty on tenure. Currently about 80 per cent of faculty members hold tenure.

Department chairmen are appointed by the Dean. Customarily, he seeks advice from the department in making the appointment. Decision making on individual faculty salaries is basically an administrative function. After guidelines are set by the budget and after consultation with the department chairman, the Dean makes the final decision. Obviously the Dean must operate within the constraints of the proposed budget and within the developing salary pattern of each faculty member.

Closely related to salary decisions are those administrative decisions which affect the student-faculty ratio. Over a period of the past three years the ratio had gradually changed from 1:10 to 1:13. This increase has meant a change in the total faculty complement from about 100 to approximately 80. In this instance, Southwestern has had a gradual change in policy relative to student-faculty ratio by actual administrative action. While final decisions in this area have been taken by the Dean, these decisions have been appreciably affected by the recommendations of the Analytical Studies Committee, an administratively organized group consisting of representation from the faculty, administration, and student body. This committee was reportedly "dormant" in the Spring of 1973.

A five-member faculty committee, known as the Faculty Professional Interest Committee, serves as a grievance committee for the Faculty. This is apparently a useful and at times necessary safety valve.

There is little or no apparent formal input from students in the implementation of faculty personnel policy. Their only formal influence, quite minimal, is through the committee structure of both the Board of Trustees and the Faculty. In contrast, an informal influence is reported as generated through the department and thence to the Dean.

Southwestern sponsors no formal evaluation of teaching —or of the classes—by students. However, the Education Commission of the Student Body Government does conduct a kind of class evaluation of teaching. Summaries of these evaluations apparently are made available to respective faculty members and are placed in the College library.

Curriculum

Policy Development. The policy area of curriculum is firmly located within faculty jurisdiction. Two faculty committees have authority and responsibility here—the standing Committee on Curriculum and the standing Committee on Educational Development. Both committees include student representation along with the usual faculty membership. The Curriculum Committee can be characterized as responsible for the routine curriculum matters. The Committee on Educational Development, in contrast, is concerned with experimentation and innovation in the area of curriculum and instruction. Apparently student involvement has been somewhat greater in the Educational Development Committee than in the Curriculum Committee. These two committees report to the Faculty for approval of their recommendations. Faculty action on such a crucial item as a major new educational program would be submitted to the Board for its approval.

In reality, all policy decisions in this area of curriculum are subject to the usual budget constraints which can directly affect expansion and innovation. The committees apparently, however, work closely with the Dean in the formulation of decisions, thereby insuring that budget implications are fully understood.

Implementation. Implementation in curriculum is the responsibility of the various academic officers of the College and of the Faculty as individuals and as members of the faculty corporate body and departments. In addition, the two faculty Committees on Curriculum and Educational Develop-

ment may be directly involved in implementation or may perform a kind of "watchdog" role.

Instruction

Policy Development. The basic composition of the student body, which has changed over the years, has had only limited consideration at a formal policy level. In fact, the Admissions Committee in its actual administrative functioning provides the decision focus in this area. In this sense, policy is determined by a faculty committee which includes both administrative and student representation. Such policy items as percentage of transfer students, numbers of commuting students, percentages of men and women are all determined within a framework of experience by the Admissions Committee.

Policy on admission requirements has been worked and re-worked by the Admissions Committee. Marked departure in ongoing policy is subject to faculty consideration and ratification.

Policy relating to faculty teaching load is clearly an administrative responsibility. Changes in the current policy, now quite flexible, are carefully considered by the Faculty. Final decision or change, as well as a possible initiation of change, would be an administrative responsibility, specifically that of the Dean, because of its extensive budgetary implications.

All other items in the area of instructional policy are within the purview of the Faculty. For example, the Faculty recently adopted a more flexible policy on the use of final examinations in the grading of students.

The Faculty, through its Library Committee, is reported to be in close touch with policy relating to the functioning of the College library.

A Student Honor System of long tradition at Southwestern is a firmly rooted policy affecting life on campus and

especially affecting the instructional area. The system is discussed in some detail above under the section on the *Students*.

Implementation. Implementation in the instructional area tends to lie with the appropriate administrators, such as the Librarian; with appropriate faculty committees, such as the Admissions Committee, or with the academic departments.

Faculty load as now determined is basically a responsibility of the faculty member himself and of his department chairman. Within the guidelines there is apparently a high degree of flexibility which assures an ample consideration of not only the usual credit-hour demands on the teacher but also his load in student counseling and the extent of work on his faculty committees.

The use of examinations, within a new policy framework, appears to be clearly an individual faculty responsibility. The policy guideline suggesting that final examinations are "normally given" implies that term examinations are a desirable instructional feature. However, the faculty member now makes his own decision.

Budgeting

Budget development in the academic area is essentially an administrative matter. The Dean has this responsibility. Guidelines fixing budget constraints are set by top administrative officers of the College. Department chairmen are consulted on anticipated needs for the new year, and insofar as possible those needs are reflected in the completed budget document. There is no direct faculty or student involvement in the budget-decision process.[2]

---

[2] In February, 1974, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College wrote: "We now have going a rather elaborate process involving both students and faculty, both for long-range (ten-year) planning, medium-range (four-year, detailed) planning, and the budget committee for the immediate next year's budget."

CHANGES IN THE PAST TEN YEARS

There was almost unanimous agreement that practically all phases of academic governance had been decentralized during the past ten years. A new presidential administration taking office in 1965 or 1966 had effected this change, moving the locus for almost all academic decision making from the office of the President to that of the Dean. While this appears to be a kind of decentralization of authority, it is to some degree a relocation of the academic power center.

It is fair to say, however, that the move toward decentralization does include a new and perhaps expanding involvement by the academic departments and their chairmen at several levels in the decision-making process.

While there have been apparent changes in the past ten years, still others can be expected within the next year or so. After several long presidencies, the last two presidents of Southwestern have had tenures of about three years each. A new president took office in the Spring of 1973. Whether the current locus of final authority will remain unchanged or whether it will change and be shared to a greater extent with faculty and students will be determined in the near future.

A change of potentially great influence on all aspects of academic decision making is the recent inclusion of both faculty and students on Board committees and on the Board itself. These are the first tentative steps, and the new participants are without vote. As channels of communication open and as the Board then begins to expand its role and that of its committees, the influence of faculty members and students will become increasingly effective.

A complementary development which can be a no less significant change of the past decade is the new openness in the Southwestern Faculty meetings and in the meetings of

most of the Faculty committees. Here students participate without vote but apparently communication is open for the expression of student opinion, concerns, and interests. One faculty member offered the opinion that faculty voice in governance of the College marks a significant change of the 1960s. Another faculty person commented on the new openness in communication for members of the student body as well as the faculty.

CHAPTER IX

WHITMAN COLLEGE

Founded in 1859 in Walla Walla, Washington, Whitman College began offering college level courses in September, 1882.

Today's program focuses on the liberal arts with the idea that the College should prepare the graduate to be a "humane and understanding" person. The program is of baccalaureate level and essentially "prevocational." The last graduating class of approximately 190, however, included about 35 graduates who had completed the teacher certification requirements, about half of these in elementary and half in secondary education. About half of each graduating class now goes to graduate school.

Major features in the Whitman curriculum are interdepartmental courses such as environmental studies, plural societies, and American studies. Another major feature is the relatively high degree of flexibility in the curriculum.

In the Fall of 1972, Whitman registered 1,067 students, about 55 per cent men and 45 per cent women. In this total of 1,067, minority groups were represented as follows: 21 black, 5 chicano, and 20 oriental. About 78 per cent of the students live in campus residences: 51 per cent of the men who are in campus residences are in fraternities; 50 per cent of the on-campus women are in sororities. Seniors have the option of living off campus.

Whitman reports a full-time faculty of 79 persons. Today, 66 per cent of these individuals are on tenure; in the Fall of 1973, 71 per cent are scheduled to be on tenure. Approximately 61 per cent of the full-time faculty are in the ranks of professor and associate professor. About 65 per cent hold the Ph.D. and an additional 13 per cent are reported to be writing dissertations.

GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Trustees

The Whitman Board of Trustees, consisting of nine members elected for three-year terms, was established in 1883 "to maintain a non-sectarian Christian institution of higher learning for the instruction of both sexes." The Trustees have the usual powers of holding property, suing and being sued, and appointing and removing college officers and faculty. Both charter and constitution specify that "the President and Professors of the institution shall constitute the Faculty of said College." These two documents also state that "the Faculty shall have the power to arrange the course of study and to take the proper measures to enforce the rules and regulations enacted by the Board of Trustees for the government and discipline of students, and to suspend and expel offenders as may be deemed necessary."

In addition to the Board of Trustees, there is a Board of Overseers of approximately 60 persons. They have such powers as may be delegated to them by the Board of Trustees. Currently, they exercise the responsibility of budget review and approval. The budget is reviewed first by the Board of Trustees and then is transmitted to the Board of Overseers "as a proposal for final action."

The Executive Committee of the Student Body Government meets with the Board of Trustees twice a year, primarily to discuss questions of student concern. This formal session is regularly extended to an informal session for other students who may wish to attend. There is a similar arrangement for the alumni Board of Directors to meet with the Trustees. Though there is less frequent formal contact between the Faculty and the trustees, there is frequent informal contact.

Faculty

The faculty of Whitman College includes the President

of the College; the Deans; the teaching staff holding the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor and instructor; the Registrar; and the Librarian, plus any other administrative staff holding professional rank. The officers are the President, the Provost, and the Deans (named by the Board), a Chairman, and Secretary. The Chairman, a relatively new position, chairs the meetings of the Faculty and of the Academic Council, and meets with the Committee of Division Chairmen. The Secretary performs the usual tasks of that office.

The Faculty has set up the following committee organization: the Academic Council, the Board of Review, the Policy Committee, the Committee of Division Chairmen, and the Academic Advisory Board.

The Academic Council is a "pre-considering, advisory, reviewing, and determinative agency for the general Faculty." Its functions include both "matters of policy" and "operational procedures." It has particular assignments in curriculum in the matter of specific courses and in "major study programs." The voting membership on the council consists of the elected members of the Board of Review, the elected members of the Policy Committee, and the three Division Chairmen. The Chairman of the Faculty, who serves as the Chairman of the Council, votes only in the case of a tie. The President, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, and the Dean of Students are non-voting members. The Registrar is a non-voting member at those meetings which are devoted to curriculum matters.

The Board of Review is concerned with the enforcement of faculty legislation. It also serves as the agency which modifies this legislation on the request of students, faculty, and administration. The Board of Review consists of three elected faculty members—three-year staggered terms—and the Registrar as a non-voting member. The senior elected member serves as chairman.

The Policy Committee "may initiate proposals, or consider proposals from the Academic Council, the President, the

Dean of the Faculty, or any Faculty member, concerning major changes of policy and curriculum." The membership consists of three elected faculty members—three-year staggered terms—and the Dean of Faculty as a non-voting member. The senior elected member serves as chairman.

The Committee of Division Chairmen is advisory to the Dean and President on "administrative policy of an academic nature," on budget in the academic area, staffing in the divisions, and for long-range academic planning. The members are the three elected Division Chairmen, the Chairman of the Faculty, and the Dean of the Faculty, who is chairman of this committee.

The Academic Advisory Board is the final group which has a concern in the academic area. It is expected "to evaluate existent academic programs, to explore the feasibility of new programs, and to submit recommendations which pertain to the academic life of the student and the curriculum." The Board membership consists of five elected faculty members, representing a breadth of curriculum interests, and five students, including the President of the Associated Students of Whitman College, the Chairman of Students' Curriculum Committee, and one major elected from each of the three divisions. Non-voting members include the President of the College, the Dean of the Faculty, and one pre-major student. The academic Advisory Board is the only major group with student members. During 1972-73, however, this group has been inactive, chiefly because of the failure of the students to elect their members. The reason for not activating this committee may be the cumbersome election process but it may be the lack of any "burning student issues" in this particular area. Student leaders expect the Board to function again in 1973-74.

Students

The students at Whitman function as the Associated Students of Whitman College (ASWC). The Curriculum Com-

mittee is the ASWC's major instrument for activity in the academic area. The chairman of this committee becomes an ex officio member of the College Academic Advisory Board, which is currently inactive. Recommendations of this committee may, however, go directly to the Academic Council. Students are reported to have had some impact on the Library and Admissions committees. They are full members of the Library Committee along with two faculty members from each of the three academic divisions. The Student Admissions Advisory Committee has had substantial, though more indirect, influence on admissions policy. Students are full members of the Financial Aids Committee.

That students are in complete charge of the Interim Period is of interest and importance. This is a two-week period in January which is organized and "produced" by students selected for this particular task. This project, although non-credit, has major teaching-learning implications. Students make all decisions relating to the Interim program. They are responsible not only for its content but for half to two-thirds of its financing.

An apparently important committee for students is the joint student-faculty Committee on Student Life. Chaired by the Dean of Students, this committee has two faculty and five student members. The Student Social Regulations Committee consists of six elected students, three elected faculty and three appointed administrators. It has sharply changed the character of student campus life. The concerns of these committees, however, are not directly in the area of academic governance.

Students are in control of their own student budget based on a fee of $24 per student. This budget covers such items as student activities, special programs, student newspaper and radio.

The President of ASWC meets weekly with the Dean of Students. Reportedly, this meeting is on his initiative and "primarily for communication." The adviser to ASWC is

chosen by the Executive Committee and is a member of the faculty, not an administrative officer ex officio.

The students, who admit their influence is largely informal, say that "student pushing" is important to get things done. Recent influence by students has touched on such areas as minority student admissions, coed dormitory assignments, changes in the grading system, the "hyphenated" major, dormitory hours, and the dress code relating to dinner in the College dining room.

ACADEMIC DECISION MAKING

Faculty Personnel Area

Policy Development. The requirement of the Ph.D. or its equivalent in selected areas became definitive policy at Whitman five years ago. While there had been a general move in that direction for some time, the policy in its present form was effected only by positive administrative action with the recommendation and support of the Committee of Division Chairmen.

The recruitment, selection, and appointment policy relating to process and criteria was also tightened up four years ago. What had been a relatively "ad hoc" process has become much more highly structured. Policy clearly calls for an assessment of need whenever a vacancy occurs. These policy decisions are made by the College administration with consultation and recommendation by the Committee of Division Chairmen.

Policy relating to faculty tenure is clearly delineated in the constitutions and bylaws of both the Board of Trustees and Faculty.

Pertinent policy which appears in both documents reads:

Section 3. Tenure

Except in the case of an original appointment to the Faculty, all appointments at the rank of professor shall be for indefinite tenure. Indefinite tenure means that the appointment shall not run for a fixed term or

period and shall be terminable only as hereinafter provided.[1] (Const., Bylaws, Art. V, Sec. 5.)

Persons holding the rank of associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor may be given indefinite tenure by special vote of the Board of Trustees at any time, but any such who have not been given indefinite tenure prior to the end of their sixth year of service shall at that time be notified in writing whether they will be given indefinite tenure at the beginning of their seventh year of service; and in the event that indefinite tenure be not given, such persons shall be entitled to a seventh year of service but shall not be continued in the service of the College beyond the end of their seventh year.[2] (Const., Bylaws, Art. V. Sec. 9)

No tenure regulations shall apply to part-time members of the instructional staff, nor shall they apply to any person holding a title other than professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor.[3] (Const., Bylaws, Art. V, Sec. 10)

That faculty members will hold academic rank and be promoted in rank is clearly implied in the documents of both the Board and Faculty. The ordering of ranks is also clear by "implication" in the same documents as well as in an administrative document prepared by the Dean. These documents list the actual "time in grade" when promotion automatically will be considered. No other qualifications which differentiate the ranks appear in the Whitman documents, but promotion is based upon specified criteria of teaching qualities, professional activities, and contribution to the college community.

Policy relating to salaries seems to be entirely administratively based. Salary ranges are overlapping by rank and

[1] Usual causes delineated by the AAUP.

[2] In practice, tenure is considered in the fourth year for appointment at the beginning of the fifth year if the faculty member has completed his professional preparation.

[3] *Codification of Faculty Legislation*, Rev. May 19, 1972.

the guidelines for the level of salaries are drawn from an annual study conducted by the deans of a group of approximately twelve privately controlled liberal arts colleges located in New England, the Middle West, and the West Coast. A further guideline mandates that salaries are to be based on merit.

Department chairmen are appointed for three-year terms by the President on recommendation of the department members and in consultation with the Dean. The College is organized in three academic divisions; the division chairmen are elected by the division members for three-year staggered terms.[4]

Policy development relating to faculty travel comes under the Committee on Aid to Faculty Scholarship. This Faculty committee, within budget limitations, develops the guidelines for allocation of funds for travel and special professional projects.

Implementation. Procedures relating to recruitment, selection, and appointment of new faculty members seem to move according to a relatively fixed routine. Once the Dean, in consultation with the Committee of Division Chairmen, decides that steps will be taken to fill a particular position, he requests a Department Chairman to undertake a search for a new appointee. In the case of a small department or one which has no chairman, the Dean himself will initiate the search. Candidates, with only rare exception, are brought to the campus for interview. Generally, if there is consensus on the appointment among the department members, Division Chairmen, and the Dean, a recommendation is forwarded to the President, and the appointment is made. In those instances when a consensus is not reached, the search is extended and additional candidates are invited to the campus for interviews. A decision is finally made when there is a consensus on the choice of a candidate.

[4] Policy relating to this organizational arrangement is provided in "The Codification on Faculty Legislation" Chapter 1, Article IV, Sections 8 and 9.

Procedures relating to decisions on tenure and promotion in faculty rank are closely allied. In the instance of tenure, evaluation must be scheduled before the end of the sixth year of full-time employment. In actual practice it is customary to institute tenure procedures during the fourth year of full-time employment. As soon as the persons are identified for consideration for tenure or for promotion, special committees are named for consideration of each individual faculty member. These committees consist of the appropriate division chairman, senior members of the department, and at least two full professors; the President and the Dean serve actively in an ex officio capacity. During the year 1972-73, there were about 35 evaluations, each by a different committee.

Salaries are developed and actually determined on the administrative level in a conference between the President and the Dean.

The President, in line with the guidelines indicated, names the department chairmen. Faculty members, however, directly elect their division chairmen.

Curriculum

Policy Development. Policy decisions in the curriculum area lie essentially with the faculty of Whitman College. Though there are doubtless some elements of leadership which may emanate from the administration and some indirect influence from the students, ultimate decision in curriculum matters is a faculty responsibility.

There are, however, limitations on this allocation of responsibility. Apparently, the decision process in the curriculum area is allied closely to the budgetary process. A decision which would require the expenditure of additional monies would be determined by an administrative committee, considering a recommendation of the Committee of Division Chairmen. The Administrative Committee includes the chairman of the Faculty.

A recent major faculty decision in curriculum significantly modified the Whitman graduation requirements. The Whitman "Guide to Program Planning" makes this statement:

> In general, a student should devote about a third of his credit hours at Whitman to course work in his major discipline, and perhaps another third to courses which contribute to and support that work. The remaining third would be devoted to breadth of study which would meet special interests of the student and which would take him into areas of study more distant from his major work.

The student program is planned carefully with his adviser. In the instance of that third of the program relating to breadth, the student is expected to have studies in most of eleven designated areas of the liberal arts at Whitman or elsewhere. His whole academic experience is reviewed individually to determine if he has adequate breadth of study.

Generally, the College has cooperated in the curriculum area with other colleges whenever feasible. Its most recent effort has been in the Northwest Association of Private Colleges and Universities. This group, administratively inspired in 1967, originally numbered 28 but now has 20 colleges. Its greatest success has been in cooperation in making library resources available.

Implementation. Implementation occurs in a variety of areas. A first point of responsibility naturally lies with each faculty member, first as a teacher and second as an adviser. Another point of responsibility lies in the Dean's office as well as in any other academic office concerned with curriculum implementation — grades, degree requirements, honors lists. The Whitman faculty uses a special committee called the Board of Review to examine all student requests for departure from stated faculty requirements in curriculum.

Instruction

Policy Development. The admission requirements of

Whitman College as they relate to the general composition of the student body are largely determined by the Admissions Policy Committee. Policy on faculty load is three courses each semester in the Social Sciences and Humanities divisions, and two courses plus laboratories for the Sciences. This policy emerged through long-time practice with no apparent faculty or administrative action. Policy, in fact, has been developed through administrative implementation.

Final examinations in courses are mandatory, a policy set by the Whitman Faculty. Comprehensive examinations administered to seniors are currently undergoing some change. The examination at this time may be entirely oral or both oral and written, and it may come about the middle of the student's senior year or toward the end of the year. While there may be differences in implementation, the policy relating to comprehensive examination is college-wide and is set by the Faculty.

The Whitman calendar includes two semesters—one before the Christmas recess and one starting in late January. During two weeks in January there is an Interim Period, non-credit and entirely student-directed. Participation is optional. Policy in this area was made by the Whitman faculty in consultation with the ASWC Curriculum Committee.

Implementation. Policy in the instructional area is implemented by several administrative officers, by the departments and divisions, and by such committees as the Admissions Committee. Finally, the Board of Review provides an additional check on the extent to which faculty regulations have been implemented.

Budgeting

The budget development process is administered by appropriate business offices under the direction of the President and the Provost. Faculty involvement comes through the office of the Dean of Faculty and is coordinated by the Dean for the entire academic area. Decision making in the matter

of salaries is in the hands of the President, who works closely with the Dean of Faculty. Tradition is the major guideline in setting policy on the percentage relationship of the academic budget to the balance of the total budget. A major guide on all budgeting is that expenditures must come within expected income. Deficit budgeting is forbidden.

CHANGES IN THE PAST TEN YEARS

By and large, governance at Whitman College in the academic area has moved to greater faculty involvement. A primary bit of evidence in support of this conclusion is the highly structured interlocking system of faculty committees. Not only are the tasks quite clearly delineated but coordination and a high measure of accountability are assured in the structure of the Academic Council. A further point of faculty involvement is the part which faculty members play in the decision on new appointments. On the other hand, faculty involvement through specially organized ad hoc committees for the decisions on promotion and tenure for each faculty member is not new. Consideration of these matters by specially appointed committees dates back many years. Budget development has apparently changed a bit during the past ten years. The academic budget is thoroughly worked over and relatively fixed when it leaves the hands of the Committee of Division Chairmen. The budget advisory committee still continues to be made up of the chief administrators of the College, but a significant recent change is in the inclusion of the Chairman of the Faculty. Salary decisions are still made by the President. However, the Dean of the Faculty possibly has a somewhat stronger influence in the whole academic area than he had ten years ago. His dual appointment as Provost and Dean of the Faculty gives him college-wide responsibilities.

Another recent change has been a shift from five divisions in the curriculum to three. The Committee of Division Chair-

men is currently used extensively in a variety of decisions in the area of academic governance. This change is one of major significance in the growth of faculty participation in decision making and toward a more democratic form of administration at Whitman College. The division chairmen are elected by their colleagues, not appointed by the Administration.

While the involvement and responsibility of faculty members have been more clearly identified and structured in fact, more formalized, the extent of student participation in academic governance has seemed to change very little. Though the students now have some limited influence—especially through the Academic Advisory Board—it is apparent that they must rely largely on an informal participation in the governance structure. It is also apparent that, if the students wished, they could have a more "meaningful" participation and a more active role through the Academic Advisory Board. Students through their student government, however, have established a new opening in communication with the Whitman Board of Trustees. These meetings are reported as of perhaps greater value to the trustees than to the students.